

# The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES      VOL. XXX No. 5      NOVEMBER 1948

## THE VOCATION OF THE SECULAR CLERGY

A SECULAR priest who meditates on the text of the ordination ceremony cannot fail to reach the conviction that it was drawn up by the Church with the intention of raising to the sacred priesthood a body of men who would work with and under a bishop in a particular district; in other words, it is primarily a matter of the ordination of secular, or diocesan, clergy. He has no desire to minimize in any way the glory of the religious orders which have done so much for the sanctification of souls and the good of the Church. He knows what we owe to the great monastic movement inaugurated by St Benedict in the sixth century, to the various orders of Friars at whose head stand the heroic figures of St Dominic and St Francis, to the army of God fashioned by St Ignatius and sent forth to the ends of the earth, to the many other religious congregations which in these later centuries have laboured so zealously for the cause of Christ; but he feels that in her ceremonies for the ordination of a priest it is for the secular clergy that the Church is chiefly providing. Indeed he may be pardoned for thinking that much of this venerable rite of ordination must sound strange in the ears of a religious who kneels before a bishop to receive the sacred priesthood at his hands. The ceremony, it may almost seem, was not made for him but goes back to something more fundamental in the constitution of the Church. Let us look at the rite of ordination to justify this.

The present rite of ordination is very ancient, but there was an older and a simpler rite which shows the way in which the priesthood was regarded in the early ages of the Church. This older form has been preserved in the midst of the many developments which have been added in the course of centuries. Many readers will be surprised to learn that in the ordination of a priest according to the formulæ contained in the old liturgical books there was no explicit reference to the power of forgiving sins or even to the power of offering the sacrifice of the Mass. Of course it is not difficult to show that these powers were conveyed

and implicitly expressed, but they were not mentioned in so many words. There was nothing corresponding to the striking words which the bishop uses when he hands to the ordinand the chalice and paten: *Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium Deo missasque celebrare*; nothing corresponding to the words: *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum: quorum remis<sup>is</sup>is peccata, remittuntur eis: et quorum retin<sup>ueris</sup>is, retenta sunt*; no description of the duties of the priesthood like that which the bishop now gives in his admonition early in the ceremony: *Sacerdotem oportet offerre, benedicere, praeesse, praedicare, et baptizare*. There was first an invitation to those who were present that they should pray God to grant His heavenly graces to those whom He had chosen *ad presbyterii munus*; then there came a short prayer that the ordinands should receive *benefictionem Sancti Spiritus et gratiae sacerdotalis virtutem*; and finally there was the *Consecratio*, which now is pronounced in the form of a Preface. It is in this *Consecratio* that we see what were the duties of a priest. In it the bishop recalls how in the desert Moses had needed the assistance of seventy prudent men to help in the direction of the people; how to Aaron had been given helpers in his sacerdotal functions; how the Apostles had been granted *Doctores fidei comites*. In like manner, the bishop explains, God has set rulers over the Church but has also chosen others to help them, and now new helpers are to be ordained for their sacred task. To be *co-operator ordinis nostri* is the only explanation given of what is involved in the *presbyterii munus*.

Here, then, we have what the early Church understood to be the character of her priests; namely men who would help the bishops in carrying on the sacred work committed by Christ to His Apostles, endowed indeed with the powers of offering the sacrifice of the Mass, etc. but possessing them in order that they might be *co-operatores* of the Bishop.

This aspect of the priesthood has in no way been obscured in the rite which the Western Church now observes. It is true that now there is explicit mention of the power of celebrating Mass, forgiving sins, baptizing, preaching, directing, but these are all part of the position of the priest as an assistant of a bishop. Indeed, in the present more elaborate ceremony of ordination fresh stress is laid upon the point that we are making. The thoughts which are expressed in the *Consecratio* are still further

developed in the preliminary address which is now given by the bishop. In this address he begs the ordinands to strive that they may become worthy helpers of the episcopate. *Tales esse studeatis ut in adiutorium Mōysis et duodecim Apostolorum, Episcoporum videlicet catholicorum, qui per Mōysen et Apōstolos figurantur, digne, per gratiam Dei, eligi valeatis.* And this idea of a priest as the helper and co-operator of the bishop is expressed again when the ordinands are addressed as *filiī dilectissimi, quos ad nostrum adiutorium fratrum nostrorum arbitrium consecrandos elegit.*

Here are traced for us the broad lines of the organization of the Christian Ministry: the bishops as the successors of the Apostles and a body of clergy who are to labour with the bishop, performing the various tasks which he shall set them and forming as it were a great ecclesiastical family—*presbyterium*—with him. The secular priest recognizes himself at once as having his place in this fundamental organization of the Church. The solemn promise of reverence and obedience which comes at the end of the ordination is the expression of the dedication of himself to the service of God under the bishop. *Promittis mihi et successoribus meis reverentiam et obedientiam?* And with his hands placed between those of the bishop he pledges himself: *Promitto.* It is in the spirit of that promise that his life's work begins: it is a promise which differentiates him from his brethren in the religious orders whose obedience and reverence are pledged directly to their own superiors.

What is his life's work to be? That will depend upon his bishop who will set him the kind of work which is judged most suitable in view of the needs of the flock of Christ in the particular diocese to which they both belong. But some general principles can be laid down. In the first place it is not for his own spiritual comfort or even directly for his own sanctification that a man becomes a secular priest. The priesthood is indeed a sacrament and it confers great graces upon those who receive it worthily, but a secular priest receives this sacrament primarily in order that he may labour for souls under the immediate control of his bishop. He has to be *providus co-operator ordinis nostri*, as the bishop said when ordaining him. This aspect of his priesthood is fundamental and ought ever to be before his mind. He must live for the good of the Church. On the day of his ordina-

tion he heard the archdeacon address the bishop in these terms. *Reverendissime Pater, postulat sancta Mater Ecclesia catholica ut hunc praesentem diaconum ad onus Presbyterii ordinētis.* It was the Holy Catholic Church which was calling him to her service and to that service all his energies are to be directed. It is true that all priests, regular as well as secular, are called to the service of the Church, but in the case of the secular priest the call has a special character. It is essentially and wholly a sharing of the pastoral work of the bishop in a way which is foreign to the service rendered by religious, and therefore to this apostolate the life of the secular priest must be entirely dedicated. Hence the provision of Canon Law (can. 969, §, 1) that no one may be ordained as a secular priest who is not, in the judgement of the bishop, necessary or useful for the churches of the diocese.

Was there ever a time when *p*astoral, *p*arochial, work was of greater importance than it is in our present age? Influences of various kinds are at work to draw masses of our people from the practice of their religion: the pagan atmosphere which is around them, the attraction exercised by the commercialized provision of pleasure, the sordid conditions in which they often pass their lives, the insidious propaganda of Communism and the general movement of the Left, the religious isolation in which they often live in the midst of great masses of men—these are some of the influences which have to be overcome. It is chiefly on the secular clergy that the task of fighting these things must fall. It is they who live in the midst of the people, they who are in closest and most constant touch with them, they to whom their welfare has been committed. A great responsibility indeed, and one which may well appeal to all that is best and most generous in the heart of a young priest. It is to this that the Church calls him.

But he is never to labour alone; he is part of a closely organized body which works in harmony and receives its orders and its instructions from one who is in the position of the Apostles. Thus there ought to be an *esprit de corps* which makes him a loyal member of the diocesan clergy and of the wider body of the secular clergy everywhere. He reverences the religious bodies, recognizing the immense value of their more specialized services to the Church and ready to co-operate with them in their work



whatever this may be; but he recognizes too the greatness of his own calling, more ancient and more fundamental than theirs and nearer to the work of the Apostles. His spirituality must be in harmony with his calling. It is not too much to say that to a great extent he must sanctify himself through the exercise of his pastoral duties. This does not mean, of course, that pastoral duties free him from the obligation of devoting much of his time to purely spiritual exercises. The Code of Canon Law sets before us what ought to be the rule of all priests in this matter of spiritual exercises. Frequent reception of the sacrament of Penance, daily meditation, visits to the Blessed Sacrament, examination of conscience, recitation of the rosary: these things a priest ought to secure, and the Church bids the bishops see to it that clerics do secure them: *Curent locorum Ordinarii* (can. 125). These things are insisted upon with loving solicitude by Pius X—a glorious example for secular priests—in the magnificent *Exhortatio* which he addressed to the clergy on the occasion of his golden jubilee. Without an earnest endeavour to succeed in such exercises a secular priest cannot hope to make a success of his ministry. But it remains true that to a great extent he must sanctify himself through the active part of his life. This, perhaps, is less simple than it might seem. It is not enough to offer his work to God and frequently to renew his intention of labouring *ad maiorem Dei gloriam*; his ideal must be to see God in the actual performance of his pastoral duties. For this he requires, and must constantly exercise, a very vivid faith which reveals to him the supernatural in what he does. For example during the wearisome hours which he spends in the confessional the man of faith will see the grace of his Master at work, and the eternal values of the task on which he is engaged; he will be conscious of the “virtue” that goes out from him because of his position as the minister of Christ; he will share the longing of Christ for the souls of men, striving to encourage the good, to strengthen the weak, to admonish the indifferent. In addition to the exercise of faith there is here an exercise of love, both of God and of man; and there is hope too in the mercy and power of the Almighty. This constant realization of the eternal values will transform all his work—his care of the sick, his instruction of the children, his preaching, his search for wandering souls, the administration of

the sacraments. When he pours the water over the head of an infant in Baptism he will see the significance of those striking exorcisms by which the dominion of the powers of evil are broken and the child is made to share the divine nature, and he will never lose that sense of awe which comes over everyone who meditates on the mighty words of the ritual. When he distributes Our Lord in Holy Communion he will aim at having some of the fervour with which St Teresa of Lisieux expressed her wish that she could be a priest. "With what love, my Jesus, would I bear Thee in my hand when my word brought Thee down from heaven! With that love, too, would I give Thee to the faithful" (*Autobiography*, p. 201). When he administers the last sacraments it will be no mechanical set of actions that he performs but a ceremony that for him is full of immense portent and mighty power, bringing him face to face with fundamental truths: the value of a human soul, the finality of death, the mercy of Our Lord, the efficacy of the Redemption, the life of the world to come. Thus to the man of faith all his priestly duties take him into the realm of the supernatural and enable him to live a God-centred, theocentric life. In him the great theological virtues are ever being brought into an activity in which Charity prevails—not merely habitual or even virtual Charity but an actual Charity which transfigures all he does.

This transfiguration by Charity is possible even in the case of many activities which do not in themselves belong to the supernatural order, such as the organization of recreational facilities, various social works, the keeping of accounts, the care of the fabric of church property and so many other preoccupations which weigh heavily on the time and energy of the parochial clergy. All this is for God: happy the priest who realizes it and brings even these activities under the supernaturalizing influence of an all-embracing Charity which inspires all that he does. This is an ideal to aim at, an ideal which is proper to his position as a priest to whom has been committed the charge of a section of the flock of Christ with all its various needs. The nearer he approaches to this ideal the more perfectly does he live that mixed life which theologians do not hesitate to rank higher than the contemplative. Here the active life and the contemplative life are combined in the truest sense of the word; the

one does not simply follow the other, a priest passing from contemplation to action; union with God, contemplation, enters into action transfusing it and giving it a contemplative value. *In actione contemplativus.*

A "mixed" life of this kind is part of the calling of a secular priest, part of his vocation. As we have already said, it needs also the faithful practice of those spiritual exercises of which the Code speaks and without which actual union with God cannot be maintained in the midst of many active duties. The secular priest must not sacrifice urgent pastoral work in favour of private prayer; but he must strive to arrange his day in such a way that private prayer is not neglected, so that the thought of God becomes part of the spiritual air he breathes. One can easily see that with an ideal such as this before his mind he need not envy the regulars the means of perfection which the religious life offers. Perfection belongs chiefly to Charity, and in a beautiful article of the *Summa* (II-II, 24, 8) St Thomas considers the question: can Charity be perfect in this life? He points out in the first place that no creature can love God as much as God is lovable, and that therefore no creature can have a love of God which is objectively perfect. The perfection of love open to a creature is that one should love God as far as one is able, *quando diligit tantum, quantum potest*. The highest degree of such a love requires that it should always be in action: *quod totum cor hominis actualiter semper feratur in Deum*; and this is possible only in heaven. But there is another degree, *ut homo studium suum deputet ad vacandum Deo et rebus divinis, praetermissis aliis, nisi quantum necessitas praesentis vitae requirit*, and this perfection is possible in our present life. Is it not evident that the pastoral clergy who are constantly handling sacred things and who devote their lives to the active work of the apostolate have a wonderful opportunity of practising this high degree of perfection? It is true that no small part of their energies must be expended in tasks of administration which are not directly spiritual, and perhaps in many of these it is impossible to realize the condition *ad vacandum Deo et rebus divinis*. But even these come virtually under the sanctifying influence of that love of God which inspires a man to undertake them and encourages him to persevere in them. Truly his vocation presents him with abundant means of sanctification.

As St Thomas says, it is chiefly in Charity, the queen of the theological virtues, that perfection consists: but the secular priesthood calls for the exercise of the moral virtues in an eminent degree and often in a manner peculiar to itself. Thus it does not demand the practices of bodily mortification which are common in religious orders but it does demand very true mortification of another kind. Every secular priest who lives in populous centres knows how burdensome and how exhausting a task it can be to fulfil the many duties that press upon him. The long hours spent in the confessional (perhaps with little air or light and with hardly enough space to stretch one's legs), the overburdened Sundays, the constant calls, the visiting of his people, the unexpected sick calls: all these things require unbounded patience and self-control and a true spirit of self-sacrifice. Here assuredly is the kind of mortification that he must practise and it is all the more severe because it does not depend upon his own choice and often comes from the unreasonable action of others. He is bound by no vow of poverty, but many a secular priest is forced to live a life of poverty more real than that of many religious: and if he is not called upon to suffer want he has an abundant field for the practice of charity and generosity. In the midst of much that is alluring he must keep a check upon his senses and his affections, girding himself daily *cingulo puritatis* and striving *immaculatum se custodire ab hoc saeculo*. This requires great strength of character, for the secular priest has to face danger in many forms. Without strength of character and the habits of self-restraint which, with the grace of God, he has developed during years of training, a secular priest is indeed in a dangerous position. There are not a few who can generously submit to a strict rule in the shelter of a monastery but could not overcome the difficulties which face the priest who is labouring in the midst of a world which is evil. The secular priest requires a strength and adaptability of character which long years in a seminary are planned to produce. As a great ecclesiastic once said to the present writer, a student must be trained in such a way that he will be able to fashion his own rule of life according to the varying circumstances in which he finds himself, and this requires that he be taught to live by a spirit rather than by a written rule.

In these pages we have been considering chiefly the secular priest who is engaged on directly pastoral work. But not all secular priests are so engaged, since not a few will be called upon to teach, to do secretarial work, to undertake administrative tasks. Perhaps they are less fortunate than their brethren who are labouring *in vinea Domini* but they are always *co-operatores* of the bishop. The work which has been committed to the bishops of the Church tends to become more and more complex and helpers are needed in many different spheres of action. If obedience calls a certain number of the clergy to work which is not immediately pastoral such priests must realize that this is none the less a very important part of the vast apostolate of the bishops. Their place in the Mystical Body of Christ is of vital concern for the advancement of the cause of their Master: this must be their inspiration and encouragement. They, like others who may feel that their special qualifications are not being used to the best advantage, have reason to recall that solemn promise of obedience and reverence which they made on their ordination day and must feel persuaded that in the faithful fulfilment of the task assigned to them will be found their own sanctification and the good of the Church.

E. TOWERS

---

## MARRIAGE GUIDANCE

ANYONE who studies the divorce court statistics of modern times cannot fail to be appalled by the hold which this disease is taking of our civilization. It would be foolish for Catholics to believe that the epidemic is passing lightly by our section of the community. It is true that the increasing flood of matrimonial disharmony is an effect of two world wars and their resultant problems. The enforced separation of husband and wife for such long periods is one of the chief contributory causes of the trouble. Yet in past centuries wars have separated husbands and wives for longer periods, and in the social history of those

times we do not find a hint of any widespread break-up of family life. The root of the evil lies deeper. It lies in the pagan and irreligious spirit which has sprung to life in the present era, and which is challenging the whole theory and system of Christian morality. The force of that challenge falls primarily on family life, which is the bedrock of Christian society. The forces of resistance are weakened by the defection and by the spirit of appeasement displayed in so many of the non-Catholic denominations.

When the inroads made by the abandonment by these denominations of the principle of marriage as a sacramental institution were fully realized there was an immediate attempt to find some remedy. Since the remedy found by the Catholic Church in an insistence on the duties and responsibilities of married persons was not acceptable to the bulk of the protestant denominations, other methods had to be found. Those methods were bound to receive the earnest attention of the Catholic Church, since her children were exposed to infection from the loose ideas so generally accepted in the world around them. In the United States of America the American Institute of Family Relations, a non-denominational organization, was one of the first in the field of marriage guidance and was followed by the Family Life Bureau of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. In Canada similar work was done by the Catholic Centre at the University of Ottawa. The outcome of the studies and experiences of these societies resulted in the evolution of marriage guidance as we know it today—marriage guidance involving, as a long-term objective, the education of those contemplating matrimony and, as an immediate palliative, the provision of experienced advice or counsel to those people who were combating a growing disharmony in their married life.

In 1938 the Marriage Guidance Council was set up in Great Britain with the support of many authorities in the Church of England and other denominations. This Council, in spite of an inevitable slowing down of its activities during the war years, did excellent work in establishing a system of marriage guidance in the country. By the beginning of 1948 it had some eighty local centres in operation, and a further sixty on which work had begun. The work of building all this up had fallen largely on the

shoulders of Dr David Mace, by whose name the organization is often known to Catholics.

From the Catholic viewpoint it was inevitable that on certain points the Marriage Guidance Council would propose a policy incompatible with our teachings. These differences concerned principally birth prevention and the attitude towards divorce. It became evident that, to safeguard the Catholic population, a Catholic organization was necessary to provide advice and help with a background of Catholic principles. In the early part of 1946 these ideas were already forming for action, and were strongly supported by Dr Mace, who realized that Catholics could not conscientiously make use of the organization which he provided.

In 1946 His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster gave his approval to the formation of the Catholic Marriage Advisory Council, to create a national body for the provision of help, guidance, and education in the principles of successful marriage. His Eminence also graciously accepted the Presidency of the Council. In its early stages the Council was occupied with establishing an advice centre in London, as a start, and with planning for its eventual expansion as a nation-wide organization.

In this same year the Government set up the Denning Committee to enquire into the causes of and remedies for matrimonial troubles. This Committee took evidence from a wide section of authoritative opinion, including His Eminence the Cardinal and the Catholic Marriage Advisory Council. In its report the Committee recommended a national network of marriage counselling centres, and urged that Government support should be given to them through existing voluntary organizations. It also emphasized the point that, because a particular organization existed for one particular denomination, it should not thereby be excluded from Government aid. In the circumstances it was obvious that it was the Catholic Marriage Advisory Council which was the immediate objective of this recommendation.

The Home Office set up a Departmental Committee to enquire into the methods of putting the recommendations of the Denning Committee into force, and made an interim grant-in-aid both to the Marriage Guidance Council and to the Catholic



Marriage Advisory Council. The final report, to which the Council can look forward with confidence, is expected in the autumn of 1948.

Since its inception the London Centre of the Catholic Marriage Advisory Council has dealt with well over 1000 applicants. Most of them came from the dioceses of Westminster, Southwark and Brentwood, for which the Centre was primarily established. But gradually an increasing number of applications have come in from all over the country, and these are dealt with by the London Centre in the absence of other local Centres.

Applications came slowly at first, but gradually the parish priests of the three dioceses realized that the Council, far from intruding on their responsibilities, was offering a service of expert advice, both in the early and later stages of matrimonial problems. Now the London Centre is dealing with some eighty cases a month, the bulk of which are sent to it by the parish priests.

In June 1948 the Council, whose legal status and position had been established by its registration as a non-profit-making company, limited by guarantee, established the London Centre as a separate entity or branch. This left the Council free to consider the wider aspects of organization on a national basis.

The problems which confronted it were threefold. First there was the need for some national centre, unattached to any particular diocese or existing organization, which would have the task of co-ordinating the work of the Council and exercising the responsibilities, implied by Home Office recognition as a qualification for grants-in-aid, of setting up standards of education and counselling. Secondly, there was the need for recognition of the supreme responsibility of the Ordinary in each diocese over the conduct of all work in that diocese. And, finally, it was necessary to preserve intact the relationship of the parish priest to his parishioner in connexion with marriage.

Of these problems the first and the last presented few difficulties. The early recognition and approval accorded by the Hierarchy in general to the work of the Council gave to it a firm foundation on which to establish its national structure. Its declared policy of working through and in complete co-operation with the parish priests, coupled with the practical efforts to put

this into effect, has already won the confidence of those priests who have made its acquaintance. The Council firmly believes that, as other priests learn of its work and methods, it will have little difficulty in winning their confidence and close support.

In studying the best methods of meeting the second problem the Council has aimed at finding a solution which, taking into consideration the inalienable rights of the Ordinary in each diocese, will give a constitutional and business-like framework to the organization as a whole. Counsel's opinion was therefore sought on this problem and has been followed as far as possible in evolving proposals for a national organization.

The Council would like to see a Branch established in each diocese in the country. The organization and administration of this Branch would be in the hands of a local Committee, which would probably, in the early stages, be itself the nucleus of the Branch. This Committee would at first be appointed by the Ordinary, who could also consult the Executive Committee of the Council for advice. The Local Committee would be responsible to the Ordinary for all local matters, whilst questions of uniformity, policy, and marriage technique would be considered by the Executive Committee of the Council. It would be the business of the Local Committee to recommend what centres should be set up in each diocese and where; the decision, of course, being left to the Ordinary.

The Centre is looked upon as the workshop of the Council, and particular care has been taken to evolve in the London Centre a model for other centres to be established elsewhere. A Centre has three elements:

A permanent staff consisting of an administrative officer who could also act as Senior Counsellor.

A panel of qualified lay Counsellors who would be responsible for initial interviews and for managing each particular case.

A panel of specialists, ecclesiastical, medical and legal, including gynaecologists, urologists and psychiatrists.

As an application comes to the Centre it is allocated to one of the Counsellors, who interviews the applicant, and, if possible, the other party to the marriage; works for reconciliation where

possible, and, when necessary, calls in one or other of the specialists. A Case Committee is also formed, drawn from the Counsellors themselves, for research work, and to advise individual Counsellors on particularly difficult cases. Counsellors are also responsible for keeping the parish priest in touch with the progress of a case, and for following up a case after it is hoped that a settlement has been reached.

The control of the technical work of the Centres must necessarily be vested in the Executive Committee of the Council, both because of its responsibilities towards the Government and because it would be the clearing house of all experience and research. The Counsellors would be recruited by the Local Committee and approved by the Ordinary. Their training would be undertaken by the Executive Committee of the Council, whose certificate would be a necessary qualification for appointment.

It might at this point be as well to emphasize the importance of the selection of Counsellors. In general they should themselves be people who have made a success of their married lives. Unmarried people and those whose own marriages have failed—even for no apparent fault of their own—have a big psychological obstacle to overcome before they can win the confidence of applicants. Counselling is a matter of temperament almost more than anything else. It involves the ability to listen, the absence of prudery or false delicacy, a gift of impartiality, and a sense of values which enables the individual to seize upon the vital things, however insignificant they may seem superficially. It needs courage, patience, and tenacity, and a sense of humour which can override despair. These qualities have to be tempered by training and experience.

The responsibility of the Council for this particular form of training leads on to their responsibility for education on marriage problems in a wider sense. Such training is already being given in some degree by a number of Catholic Societies and individuals, and it is no part of the Council's policy to attempt to displace such work. There is an obvious need for some co-ordination of policy, and some recognized standard of teaching, in which the Council will play its full part. But it is in a wider sphere of education that the Council's more immediate responsi-

bility will lie. It has already held a series of courses, parallel with those of the Marriage Guidance Council, for young men and women—officers and other ranks—of the Army, and the success of these is leading to a call for their extension to other geographical Commands of the Army in this country. The Navy and Royal Air Force are also displaying interest. Approaches have now been begun to county and municipal Education Authorities, and to the Universities, for the extension of courses into their spheres. These approaches have so far been met with sympathy, understanding and co-operation.

At present the organization of these courses has to be directed from the national executive. In course of time, however, although the direction of instruction will have to remain under central control, it is hoped that local panels of approved lecturers will take some of the burden off the small band of pioneers who have already made such headway.

Education must also be supplemented by suitable publications, and work has already been started on some of these. In many cases their nature will be such that it will be advisable to ensure that they are not made available for indiscriminate purchase, but that the issue is made through parish priests and Societies who can ensure that they will fall only into the right hands. Others will, of course, be available to the general public.

Such, in brief, is the account of the work and the purpose of the Catholic Marriage Advisory Council. It is essentially a humanitarian work, and it provides for those engaged in it an insight into the real human problems of today, of which the clergy are already so well aware. There is a temptation to illustrate the work by stories based on the actual experiences which have come before the Council. To do so, however much such stories might be disguised, might destroy the policy accepted by the Council, that each individual case must be treated as being absolutely confidential. Only by a strict interpretation of this policy can the Council hope to claim "privilege" for those engaged in its work, or to justify the view of the Denning Committee that consultation with recognized marriage guidance organizations cannot be looked upon as tantamount to any form of "collusion".

The work goes on, and so it will go on as the activities of the

Council become more widely known, and as the facilities which it can provide become more widely distributed. It is a work which is fulfilling a desperate need in this country today, and which must take its place in the defences that the Catholic Church is erecting against the modern menace of paganism. But, appreciating the magnitude of the task, the Council is aware of its helplessness without the active support and wholehearted co-operation of the clergy throughout this country. With due humility it asks for a ready sympathy with and a clear understanding of its hopes and purposes. It has the blessing of the Archbishops and Bishops, and, with this behind it, it can appeal with confidence for recognition by the clergy in general as a means of providing ready and expert assistance for the matrimonial cases which they encounter in their pastoral duties.

J. G. FRERE

---

### WORDS AND DOCTRINES

WORDS are the best means we have for passing on our thoughts to others. With words we can express some part of our ideas and convey our essential meaning. But even for the masters of words—and they are few—it is impossible to convey thought perfectly. No words can possibly hold all that is in the mind at any point of time on even a single subject. If I think "The trees are beginning to blossom," I can say just that part of my thought in just those words: but I cannot put into those or any other words the swift spontaneous searching of my mind through memory, and all the images illuminated one by one as the searchlight of thought touches them—acres of peach blossom near Genoa, a solitary, nameless bloom in the garden at home, the sudden flowering of apple-trees at St Andrä. For myself, the words are inadequate. For my hearer, they are inadequate, and perhaps misleading. Not only is he ignorant of much of the history which the words recall for me, but he is himself sent off by the same words into a history very different from mine. The thought of spring has for him the reminder of his own travels,

griefs, happiness. My words, "The trees are beginning to blossom", give the fact of a natural change. Beyond that, they give further truth only to those who know something of my history and character and habit of mind, and who can, by understanding and sympathy, relate that knowledge to themselves and to their own feelings.

Every word that carries meaning—noun, pronoun, verb, adverb, adjective—contains something of the life-history of the one who uses it. When first we use a word, it has no depth of meaning for us. "Green" means a colour that we can distinguish from red and blue and the rest. Gradually, as we store experiences, it means the green of grass, the fresh green paint of doors and window-frames, a dress, the soft emerald of the bog when the sun shines into it, the frightening depths of the sea. All words are like that, when we use them consciously and deliberately. They have a core of meaning which is the same, or can be the same, for all users and hearers. That is the meaning which is essential to the imparting of ideas. They have also a content of experience which gives them their special meaning for ourselves. That further meaning is harder to impart; and the effort of imparting it needs to be measured if obscurity and misdirection are to be avoided.

This quality of words imposes on us an obligation of using them with care, if we wish to express our mind so that others can understand it. In ordinary speech there is less need for careful choice of words. Most people, conversing in trains or queues, are not searching all the time for just the right word to express an exact truth. Their words convey their thought in general. They use expressions which have no precise meaning. "O.K." will serve to cover any number of shades of approval or agreement. "Marvellous" or "smashing" will show that they like the weather, or a pet dog, or the football results, or a new hat, or anything at all. They give the title "friend" to mere acquaintances. They say, about minor domestic troubles, that they were "mad" or "frantic". When they come to the end of a stream of unconsidered speech, they have said very little, and they have not interested their hearers deeply: but no great harm has been done, because they were talking of trivialities, with no urgent need to measure their words. But when the subject is important,

then words must be measured. The essential is that there be a core of truth which can be at once grasped by the hearer. In careless speech, the word "miraculous" might be used for an event which is just surprising and unexpected, like the saving of a boat's crew in a raging storm. In careful speech, "miraculous" can refer only to the visible intervention of God in human affairs contrary to the ordinary laws of nature, as in the cure, all of a sudden, of a disease which is known to medical science as incurable. Similarly, careless (and feeble-minded!) speech might refer to a new dress as "divine": but careful speech keeps the word for reference to God.

Both speaker and hearer have their part to play in establishing the right use of words. Both speaker and hearer must know the root meaning of the word, and something of its history, before the word can bring their minds together. When I talk of "faith" to a Catholic, our minds are united in the fact that faith is the intellectual acceptance of truth which we learn from God's supernatural revelation. But if I talk of "faith" to a Protestant, we are not at one in a fact of doctrine, because for him "faith" is not knowledge but an emotional trust in God.

Unhappily, many of our Catholic words fail to unite minds in the sharing of truth. Our words often have two meanings, one for the speaker and another for the hearer. I could not talk of "piety" and hope that my hearers would at once understand what I meant by it. Many of them would think of some mild, emotional, uninspiring manner of loving God, of practices which commend themselves to the very young or the very old, of goodness which will not set the world on fire but which keeps the gentler sort of people out of harm. What the word used to mean, before misuse made a hole in it through which the doctrine has trickled away, was the Christian's love of God shown specially in love for all the household of God—its people, institutions, causes, movements, music, and even furniture and ornaments. It is our love of home.

"Devotion" is another word from which strength has been drained. It suggests, nowadays, a non-essential and largely emotional private addition to the necessary worship of God. The emotion may well be sincere and genuine, but somehow it arouses resentment in those who do not feel it, together with a deter-



mination to resist attempts to inspire it. "Devotion" should mean the turning of one's will and one's life Godwards, a dedication to God, in a special way, which is rooted in a reasoned and almost cold acceptance of the infinite truth of the goodness of God and of His love. Instead of showing those doctrinal roots clearly, it now seems to begin and end in emotions and feelings.

Take, for example, that special love we should have for Our Lord's love. "The goodness and kindness of God our Saviour have appeared." They touch us personally, because Our Lord is a Person, and He treats us as persons, loving us with a personal love (which is, in fact, the only possible kind of love. There is no such thing as impersonal love.) The Church has always held and taught that truth. God has insisted on it in special revelations. It is an inspiring and comforting truth, and worth the full response of our own unfailling love. But when that doctrine is recommended as "Devotion to the Sacred Heart", the very word "devotion" seems to obscure the dogma for many. They ought to find new wealth for themselves in the endless riches of the doctrine of the Incarnation of the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, and in the union of the Divine Nature and of human nature in that Person. Instead, they resent what they consider to be, in many books and sermons on "Devotion" to the Sacred Heart, an attempt to transfer to them the emotions and feelings and enthusiasms of the writers and preachers. The attempt fails, because either there is a stubborn rejection of the emotions of others, or, if feelings are adopted for a time at second-hand, they die out soon—religious feelings will last only if they grow from doctrine.

The fault seems to be in the use of the word. It is given the personal content of feeling and fervour—and that is the part of meaning which is most difficult to communicate. But it is not given its core of doctrine, which can be communicated, and which unites speaker and hearer in the sharing of truth.

Inside the noble "Devotion to the Sacred Heart", there is another word that fails to do its doctrinal duty. That is the word "reparation". Like the word "devotion", it fails often to show its centre of doctrine. To many, it suggests a pious pessimism over the world's disregard of Our Lord, and a morbid seeking of suffering as the primary expression of love for the Sacred Heart. I think many who use the word "reparation" freely would be

horrified at the resentment aroused by it in minds which are fully Catholic and willing to be good.

Again, the word is not achieving union of minds in the possession of truth. It has lost the core of rich meaning on which union of minds could be founded. Perhaps even for those who use the word easily it no longer brings to mind all the ennobling truths in the doctrine of the Redemption and of the Mystical Body of Christ: that we are part of Our Lord's Church, His Mystical Body, by His gift to us of supernatural life; that we live with Him in the Church, which is His Body, and that we also suffer with Him; that we are able to share in His Passion, "filling up in our body what is wanting to the sufferings of Christ", taking our providential sufferings in company with Him, and volunteering for added hardship so that we may be more of a help to Him.

The cause of the trouble seems to be that those who are very much at home with religious practices, and who work consciously and methodically at using the life of grace within them, develop a professional vocabulary. That becomes harmful even to themselves, if they do not frequently advert to the root meanings of such words as "devotion", "reparation", "piety", "zeal", "fervour", and countless others. Even the word which we use for the greatest of the virtues has, for many, lost its content of dogmatic truth; and we need to remind ourselves that "charity" means love of God and love of people. If we do not return constantly to the doctrine that should be intended in our words, then the words become a hindrance to thought and an obstacle to truth. Those who are not familiar with special devotions, or with more intense expressions of love of God, are not helped by the use of professional words, any more than they are helped to knowledge of truth by the jargon of politicians and psychiatrists. They need to have basic truths and principles explained in simple, everyday, non-technical language. They need to start with doctrine, and not with the fervour and feelings which have sprung from a presupposed (and unexplained) doctrine.

What, then, is to be done about words like "devotion" and "reparation"?

It would be wrong, presumptuous, and a waste of time, to suggest that they should be abandoned. Their use is consecrated

in the Church: they do express truth: and they are with us to stay. What is needed is that we who use the words should use them in their proper place. We misuse them if we give only their secondary meaning, the part which belongs to us personally because it is the feeling that has grown in us from our acceptance of doctrine, and if we fail to ensure, if necessary by preliminary instruction, that the fundamental doctrine is conveyed, to be the ground in which the personal enthusiasm of our hearers can grow. (The hearers themselves are under an obligation to be reasonable about their distaste for "devotion", and to seek for the doctrine that is there to be found. Then they can let the doctrine grow in them, so that its expression will be their own, and not an alien frill which they will soon shrug off.) The proper place for the use of such words as "reparation" is that point in the hearer's development and education where the word can lead him from his knowledge and love of Our Lord into a greater knowledge and another expression of love.

Reparation is part of any true love. We have all taken to it in our human relationships. When members of our family, or our friends, suffer a hard knock or a disappointment, we try to make it up to them, so that they will be comforted and helped, and so that they will not feel solitary and miserable. If they are let down, we say, by our actions and perhaps by our words, that we are sorry they have been let down, but that, for what we are worth, they can count on us. We have had the same experience ourselves, from the other side, finding that "a friend in need is a friend indeed". We are not forever grieving over our brothers and sisters and our friends, saying to ourselves that nobody loves them, that they meet coldness and rebuffs at every turn. We have plenty of fun with them, and we are proud of the power that they have of making friends who are staunch and loyal as friends must be. But, when they do need us, there we are, loyal and dependable.

Well, that is "reparation", whatever you choose to call it. It is the doctrine of loyalty in friendship, of friendship in need and not just in fair weather: the doctrine, in short, of friendship worthy of the name.

When that is seen in relation to Our Lord, the doctrine of "Reparation" will not repel anyone who knows what love is.

Our Lord, the most attractive Being in our human history, a Person with all that we have of personality and with infinitely more, loving us personally as we love our family and friends personally (how else can anyone give and receive love!), but with gentleness and courtesy and delicacy and strength beyond any perfection that a mere human being can achieve, is bound to us in friendship. We are happy with Him always: we are delighted when others come into His friendship: we are sorry when some despise Him—and then we say, in action, that we are not much but He can count on us: and we go out of our way to stand hard-ship in His company, so as to make up to Him for disappointments, and in order to help Him, as far as we may, in His work of bringing human beings to goodness. There is no extravagance in that: it is the stuff of friendship.

That is what "Reparation" should mean to all who are Christians. It should mean that rich doctrine to those who like the word "reparation", and to those whom it now makes uneasy. And it will mean that if the word is so used that the practice of reparation is shown to be what we all give, and expect to receive, in friendship, and that it is an essential part of the doctrine that "the Word was made flesh, and dwelt amongst us".

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

## HERALDS OF THE SECOND SPRING

### VIII. FREDERICK LUCAS

CONVERTS were to play an increasingly large part in the Catholic revival, when Newman's surrender was accompanied by that of many gifted Anglican clergymen, and earnest men whose wealth or social influence gave them special scope for assisting the Catholic Church in England. But in the earlier years after the Emancipation Act of 1829, before the Tractarian movement had gathered momentum and before the great influx of refugees from the Irish famine, the zealous convert had extra-

ordinary opportunities if he had the energy and the ability to make use of them. Ambrose Phillipps was a remarkable instance because he possessed no large resources, and he could only act, as an extremely young man, by exercising an entirely personal influence which had astonishing results. His friendship with the Earl of Shrewsbury enabled him to gain the Earl's support for many bold ideas, such as the gothic revival and the revival of liturgy and church music. He was so persuasive and so insistent that he even carried Lord Shrewsbury with him, against his wishes, when he founded his Trappist monastery, and encouraged the introduction of Rosminian and Passionist missionaries from Italy. Pugin was in a far stronger position than Phillipps for exerting his own influence, as an architect of genius and extraordinary energy; and when he and Phillipps and Shrewsbury all started collaborating for the same purposes they achieved prodigious results.

But Frederick Lucas, as a convert from Quakerism who had no previous Catholic contacts, was in many respects the most remarkable of them all. He had only become a Catholic in the previous year, when he was invited in 1840 to found and edit a Catholic weekly newspaper, which reached a vastly wider public than the quarterly *Dublin Review* ever could; although only a few years earlier that had been regarded as a very ambitious departure. And Lucas not only became editor of *The Tablet* and developed it rapidly into an organ which was accepted as the chief platform for Catholic propaganda and controversy. He impressed his own personality on it very strongly, and involved it in a series of impassioned controversies which brought him into opposition to most of the leading laity, and sometimes to bishops as well. He had not even had much previous experience as a journalist, and he had none as an editor. His conversion was so recent that the older Catholics, and especially the clergy, might well have resented his dogmatic attitudes, and his vehement attacks on the traditions and customs which he disapproved. Yet, without any talent for diplomacy or for reconciling different points of view, he succeeded in making *The Tablet* a weekly newspaper which performed invaluable service for many years, and helped to establish a tradition of well-informed and dignified Catholic comment on current affairs,

Born in 1811, he was two years younger even than Ambrose Phillipps, and some ten years younger than Wiseman, who was just forty when he returned to England as a coadjutor bishop in 1840. But *The Tablet* had just been founded, with Lucas as its young convert editor, when Wiseman came to Oscott in that year. His father was a corn merchant in the City of London, and both his parents were Quakers. They sent him to University College, London, when it was first opened in 1828, after the new London University had been established on undenominational lines. It was intended to provide for those who were penalized at the older Universities for not being members of the Established Church. He was an enthusiastic young man, though shy with strangers, and a voracious reader, with a wide range of interests. The College debating society gave him scope, and he decided to go to the Bar. In 1835 he was called at the Middle Temple. He continued to be a practising member of the Society of Friends, and according to his brother who wrote his biography, he "knew absolutely nothing of the Catholic Church until the year 1837, when his attention was first drawn to the subject by an article on Cathedral Establishments in *The Quarterly Review*". This appears to have started him on a new train of investigation, but his religious opinions remained unaffected until early in 1839.

Then he made the acquaintance of the barrister T. Chisholm Anstey, who had become a Catholic in the earliest phase of the Tractarian movement. Anstey had been born in Tasmania, where his father owned large estates, and he afterwards became a well-known parliamentary barrister. During the Irish famine he was elected member for Youghal as an English Repealer, at the instigation of his friend Smith O'Brien, M.P. O'Brien had employed him frequently on parliamentary business, and had decided to retire from Parliament himself in disgust, in order to concentrate upon famine relief problems in Ireland. Anstey, although an Englishman, was a Repealer, and he had been a constant contributor to the *Dublin Review* since its foundation, and he had been concerned in its financial management during those years. His persuasive powers seem to have affected Lucas as swiftly as young Ambrose Phillipps's persuasion had argued George Spencer into resigning his living as an Anglican clergyman so that he could become a Catholic priest. The biography

of Lucas states simply that "in some conversations with Mr T. C. Anstey the truth flashed upon his mind, and in less than a week he had satisfied himself that with the Catholic Church alone is lodged Divine authority on earth".

There were many sudden conversions in those years; and there were to be sarcastic complaints about the readiness of Wiseman to admit former parsons to the Catholic priesthood after the shortest theological training. But Lucas knew almost as little about the Church of England as he did about the Catholic Church up to the year 1839; and it is surprising to find that within a year he was being pressed by his Catholic friends to become the editor of a national Catholic newspaper. The Jesuit Father Lythgoe received him into the Church. Very soon afterwards he published a pamphlet to explain his "Reasons for Becoming a Roman Catholic". It was addressed to the Society of Friends; and he had previously written a letter to the Kingston Monthly Meeting of Friends resigning his membership and expressing the hope that they also would follow him into the Catholic Church. It was Father Lythgoe who in the following year suggested his appointment as editor of the weekly newspaper which some of the Catholic laity were then anxious to establish.

The choice was all the more surprising because the leading Catholics were generally supporters of the Whig Ministry. Young Mr Lucas held strong political views and he was extremely critical of the Whigs, because he regarded them as insincere in their professions of devotion to reform. Most of the Catholic landowning families had a strong Whig tradition, since the introduction of the various Catholic Relief Acts. There were a few exceptions, such as the Earl of Shrewsbury. He was a fervent upholder of Tory principles, which were shared by his two convert friends Phillipps and Pugin. Whigs and Tories alike regarded O'Connell as a vulgar demagogue, whose Irish nationalist demands they regarded as being almost treasonable. Lucas was not yet thirty, but he already held decided political opinions. He had no sympathy whatever with the Toryism of Lord Shrewsbury, and he believed that the leading Catholics were always ready to sacrifice their principles to the party interests of the Whigs. For O'Connell, as a man who had performed great services by forcing the Catholic Emancipation Act against Pro-



testant opposition, he had a genuine regard, but he disagreed strongly with O'Connell's agitation for Repeal. Hence his chances of success in editing a lay Catholic weekly must have seemed extremely slight to those few who knew his uncompromising character.

The venture was financed by two gentlemen named Keasley who were engaged in the leather trade. They accepted Father Lythgoe's recommendation of his recent convert and agreed to his stipulation that "he must be perfectly free to advocate whatever policy justice and truth appeared to him to demand". Lucas himself was anxious to avoid any appearance of claiming to represent Catholic opinion generally; and he chose the non-committal title *The Tablet*, and affixed to its leading page the quotation from Edmund Burke, "My errors, if any, are my own: I have no man's proxy." In his first issue on 16 May, 1840, he published his "brief confession of political faith". It declared that he was "not a blind partisan of any body of statesmen, but between the two parties he prefers the Whig Government". Regarding Ireland he announced that "We are no Repealers; but we look upon the cry for Repeal to be the most natural for the inhabitants of a country which has been governed with such fatal disregard of all the plainest rules of justice and prudence." It was not until three years later that he first visited Ireland, and there became converted to Repeal. Thereafter *The Tablet* became an ardent advocate of O'Connell's views. But long before that time his vigorous attitudes had aroused intense opposition, though he gained a wide following by his integrity and courage. He quickly antagonized the leading Whig families. Before long he was writing ferocious onslaughts on the attitude of Lord Shrewsbury towards the Irish bishops. But the appearance of a Catholic weekly was eagerly welcomed by the more courageous laymen. His chief supporters among them were Mr Charles Weld of Chideock, Charles Waterton, Colonel Townley, the Hon. Charles Langdale and the Hon. Charles Clifford. His friend, the convert barrister Chisholm Anstey, with his *Dublin Review* connexions, was a constant ally; and among the older Catholics he received support particularly from Bishop Briggs.

Within the first month Lucas was already involved in a controversy with *The Times*; and almost immediately in another

with the *Univers* in Paris, which was the most important Catholic weekly in Europe. Prudence would have dictated at least a moderate attitude in criticizing the *Univers*, when it was championing the claims of France as a Catholic country, especially for a new Catholic weekly which aspired to hold a similar position in England. Conflict between France and Egypt had involved the safety of the Holy Places, and Louis Veuillot's *Univers* had joined the patriotic outcry in France against any interference with French rights in that part of the Middle East. A war scare blew up, and Lucas boldly challenged the right of France to claim any protectorate over places which were sacred to Christendom. By the end of August Lucas was writing in *The Tablet*:

Is France, after having for half a century and upwards done more than any other nation to propagate impiety and obscenity, and whose popular literature has even now hardly ceased to be an agglomeration of the worst and vilest corruption—is France now so thoroughly identified with Christianity as to say 'He that is not with me is against Christianity'? We apprehend that most of our readers will think not.

The new mouthpiece of the English Catholics certainly did not lack liveliness, and the *Univers* in Paris responded vigorously. It may be doubted whether Louis Veuillot appreciated that his opponent was a young man still in his twenties who had been a Quaker until two years before. But even in English affairs, the pugnacity of the young *Tablet* was startling. Lucas had already said what he thought of the Tories, in his profession of political faith in the first issue. He had explained that on most fundamental problems of politics—"the present mixture of aristocracy and democracy"; the authority of the Crown; and the machinery of Parliament—there was "very little difference between Lord John Russell and Sir Robert Peel". But he stated boldly his belief that many of Sir Robert Peel's followers were not even sane; and to them alone "the peace of the empire could not be left for a single hour".

Their opinions are a strange medley of truth and falsehood, of sense and nonsense, of maxims borrowed with little judgment, from other times and other systems than their own. . . . Fanatical without religion, unbending in their purposes but unscrupulous

in their means, and capable of waiving their principles for a time to secure their ultimate more sure triumph; restless, meddling, rash, heedless, and impatient. . . . they have in England made hateful the designation of Ultra-Tory, and in Ireland have consigned to eternal infamy the name of Orangemen.

Even from the most privileged censors of morals Lord Shrewsbury and his Tory friends would scarcely have accepted such a diatribe. Yet Lucas was not only a very young man but a quite recent convert from the Quakers. The Catholic Whigs, who were far more numerous, may have enjoyed such candid outbursts against their political opponents. But their turn was to come very soon. They applied the Whig doctrine of free trade and private enterprise as the first test in considering reforms that were urgently needed to relieve distress. That issue was to arise on an overwhelming scale during the three years of famine in Ireland; but even in 1840 Lucas had already thrown down his challenge with an article on "Ancient Charity and Modern Poor Laws". It was based on an official report which contrasted the conditions which then existed in Birmingham and in Aston. At that very moment the Passionist Father Dominic Barberi, with all the fervour and the primitive simplicity of the Middle Ages, was preparing to commence his lonely mission in the Potteries. Lucas seized upon the report to point a moral, which was more vivid to him now as a Catholic, though it had always been clear to him as a Quaker:

In this report an attempt is made to prove, by a sufficient array of figures and statistical tables, that Aston is blessed above Birmingham in its moral state, by reason mainly of the operation of the new system of poor laws. The ratepayers are taxed less heavily, the paupers are a smaller percentage, the cases of imposture are less numerous, the management of poor business is more businesslike, the presumed savings of the lower classes are greater in amount and their character for prudence and forethought much improved. . . . Now it seems to us that to treat the subject in this manner is to overlook a host of considerations, which, however much they may have been despised in Pagan times, ought not to be overlooked in a country that calls itself Christian. . . .

The article ran to great length, according to the journalistic practice of the time. It disclosed radical views which must have been extremely disquieting to that section of influential readers whom any ordinary editor would have wished to placate and encourage. For instance, Lucas stated openly that "Where there is all this honest desire for the poor man to receive no penny above his strict earnings, we should like (did we not fear it would prove rather a hazardous experiment) to see the same stern law in force for the rich." He embarked on a dissertation upon the mediæval Christian attitude towards giving charity:

The object of the new poor-law organization is to create an array of practical functionaries, who have to perform two most arduous functions, one of which is to teach a lesson of economy to the poor, the other to discharge a duty of economy to the rich. That means employed are well adapted to this end we are far from denying.

The object which the sages of the Middle Ages had in view was very different, and we must confess that the motives we have just described weighed very little with them. . . . In regard to the poor, also, the aim is very different. Now it is to teach economy by harsh restraint; then it was to teach the poor love through charity. To attain the first end, the dispenser must be niggardly, and must weigh every penny he bestows with the nicest and strictest caution. To attain the other end, the dispenser had to give cheerfully, to give liberally. . . .

A reference to *Sartor Resartus* indicates that Carlyle exercised a strong influence over the young editor who was proud to claim his friendship. It is to Carlyle's credit that his *Past and Present*, an essay on social economics of the Middle Ages, had helped to provide the first political programme of *The Tablet*. But neither Carlyle nor Lucas could yet have imagined that missionary priests from Italy, wearing their religious costume and in bare feet, were already in England impatiently awaiting their superiors' permission to start their mediæval work in Aston, which had provided Lucas with the text for his manifesto.

The young editor was quite certainly a prophet, according to his own lights; but there were other eager Catholic prophets whose lights were not the same as his. Ambrose Phillipps, for in-

stance, had a vision of reunion between a Catholicized Church of England and Rome. That inspired not only Pugin and Lord Shrewsbury, but even Wiseman at Oscott and Mgr Acton in Rome, within the limits that their keen experience allowed. Phillipps dreamed, with always increasing enthusiasm, that the Church of England was heading rapidly towards a formal reunion with Rome, and that by a process of converting the aristocracy and the higher clergy the whole country would return to its pre-Reformation traditions. One result of that momentous reunion, he believed, would be to produce a mighty access of new Catholic influences by the fusion of the Established and the Catholic Churches in Ireland and in the colonies. Today it requires an effort of imagination to recall the comparative difference in populations which existed at that time. Ireland in 1840 had nearly eight million people, of whom seven million were Catholic; while Great Britain had barely twenty million. A return of the Church of England to the Church of Rome would consequently have commanded the allegiance of some seven million Irish Catholics, who had hitherto been deeply hostile. It would also, as Phillipps fondly believed, have catholicized the Established Church in Ulster, and thereby extinguished the Protestant influence of the Orange Lodges. The idea was, of course, fantastic; but Phillipps believed in it so strongly that he persuaded even Wiseman to forward to Rome his long memorandum on the possibilities as he saw them.

To Frederick Lucas, however, who was even younger than Phillipps, and a radical at heart instead of a Tory, the problem appeared quite differently. Both were converts, who had no background of Catholic tradition; and each had attained a position of unexpected personal influence. But whereas Phillipps believed that the "Oxford Men" would produce a master-stroke of reconciliation which would bring the entire Established Church back into Catholic unity with Rome, Frederick Lucas had no such illusions. He was counting solidly upon the growth of population in Ireland to increase the Catholic minority within the United Kingdom, until it reached the dimensions of a very formidable proportion. For that reason particularly he regarded O'Connell's agitation for Repeal of the Act of Union as a grave menace to Catholic interests. While the Union of both countries

lasted, it meant that at least seven million Catholics in Ireland, and fully another million in Great Britain, could in time be mobilized to assert their rights. To withdraw Irish representation from Westminster seemed accordingly a reckless undermining of the potential Catholic influence in the Parliament of the Empire.

He set forth his view with customary plainness in November 1840, when O'Connell was doing his utmost to revive in Ireland the national agitation for Repeal, which had fallen into abeyance. "Take the Catholics of the United Kingdom as a compact body; they form one third of the entire population," Lucas wrote. It was the Act of Union, he argued, which "gave to the efforts of the Irish Catholics an imperial character". Whether they liked it or not, Lucas believed that the Union had imposed upon them a moral responsibility to remain within the Union as a safeguard to Catholic interests.

Out of Ireland the Church of God in this empire would at this moment be sitting in captivity, a slave and an outcast, perhaps for centuries to come. Those who know and have seen the increased activity which has been communicated to every Catholic enterprise in Great Britain and in the Colonies during the last twelve years, can best appreciate the grievous loss which Catholicism would have sustained if the Act of Union had never passed. In the Supreme Legislature of the empire, the Catholic Church would be shorn of nine-tenths of its strength. . . . United, the Catholics are one-third of the empire, and more numerous than any other denomination. Separated, what are we? It is the old story of the bundle of sticks.

As an argument against Repeal, that was very different to the usual outcries about disintegration of the Empire. As a devout and apostolic Catholic, O'Connell was quite prepared to argue the issue on its merits. But his demand for Repeal was inspired both by the nationalist ideal and by the bitter experience since the Union which showed that the Imperial Parliament neither knew nor cared how to relieve the appalling distress in Ireland. Certainly Lucas showed complete impartiality in his readiness to estrange O'Connell's followers as well as the Whigs and the Tories; and it is surprising that *The Tablet* on those lines suc-

ceeded in gaining any following at all. In reply to O'Connell's rejoinders he asserted firmly that

We feel ourselves bound strenuously to oppose Repeal, because we believe it impracticable—and in addition to its other evils, calculated to inflict a grievous blow on the prosperity of the Catholic Church.

Yet he had the courage to admit changes of opinion, even within very short periods. Three months later he was insisting that

no Government can safely or wisely administer the affairs of Ireland which does not govern in the *spirit* of Repeal; which does not act on the principle that Ireland as well as England must have a national government; must be governed, not as England must be governed, but in all practicable respects as Ireland would govern herself through the means of a domestic Parliament.

What the proprietors thought of this highly independent editorship is not recorded. Like most new journalistic ventures, *The Tablet* was soon incurring losses; but before they had time to accumulate for even one year, the Keasleys' leather business failed and Lucas had to find new financial backing. The printer was a Protestant and a Tory; but he agreed to continue publication in partnership with Lucas without interfering with his editorial rights. But within three months more Lucas had aroused the anger of the Tory Catholics, and Lord Shrewsbury and others took steps to procure his removal from the editorship. O'Connell, however, had rejoiced at his attacks on the Tories, and he gave *The Tablet* public support in Ireland. But by February 1842, within less than two years since it started, Lucas lost patience with his many critics and decided to launch a new weekly under the title *The True Tablet*. His attacks on the Tories had by then gained him considerable popular support. A body-guard of Irish Catholics assembled at the office to enable him to remove the lists of former subscribers.

Even so, Lucas had to appeal for financial assistance. Mr Charles Weld consented to act as trustee, and within two months the appeals had raised enough capital to ensure publication for two years more. His supporters by this time included Lord



Camoy and Lord Stourton, Sir Charles Wolseley, Mr Silvertop and Sir Charles Tempest, besides Bishops Baines and Briggs and several of the Irish bishops. It was a stormy background for the religious weekly which Newman and his friends at Oxford were already reading constantly as the nearest approach to an official Catholic organ in the Press. But Lucas owed much of his following to the fact that he had given invaluable personal support to many Catholic good works which were then struggling to life. He found it advisable to retire from the secretaryship of the A.P.F., as he had become so much a centre of controversy. But in *The True Tablet* he was able to conduct vigorous campaigns to expose many urgent Catholic grievances, such as the refusal to appoint Catholic chaplains even in war time, or various glaring injustices in the colonies.

At the new year in 1843 he boldly enlarged *The Tablet* and took a further audacious step by printing above his leading articles a picture of Our Lady with the Holy Child, and underneath it the motto *Sub tuum praesidium confugimus, sancta Dei genitrix*. This was just the sort of pious demonstration which the older Catholics abhorred, and which they were already opposing whenever the Italian missionaries were introducing similar practices. Years later in Paris there was to be a similar storm of controversy over the use of a crucifix as a journalistic emblem on the front page of the daily newspaper *La Croix*. Protests poured in upon *The Tablet* even from some of his chief supporters; but Lucas had acquired confidence in the years and he refused to give way. Claiming that every man had a right to choose his own motto, he insisted that this was the one of his own choice. Finally he closed the controversy with a bold assertion that "all the subscribers within the four seas should not tempt him to change". But the matter was more than personal. Like the other converts, Lucas was in full revolt against the tradition of secrecy in religious matters which the older Catholics had derived from centuries of persecution. What he called the "sacred privacy of religion" was an attitude which he was determined to overcome, and in fact *The Tablet* did much to destroy it.

It had become a platform upon which men of every opinion found it necessary to speak or to utter protests. Lord Shrewsbury and Ambrose Phillipps particularly disliked his politics, and they

deplored his sceptical attitude towards Newman and the Tractarians. Phillipps had worked himself into a conviction that Newman and his friends, even after the suppression of Newman's Tract XC, were exerting such influence within the Church of England that no word of harsh criticism against the Established Church ought to be permitted. He even doubted whether individual conversions should be encouraged except in special cases. But for Lucas, as a convert from the Quakers, the Established Church held no character of sanctity. He had no patience with what he called the "excess of flattery" that Phillipps and his friends devoted to it. Newman himself probably had more sympathy with Lucas than with Phillipps during these critical years, when every symptom or sign that suggested an advance towards his surrender to Rome was being chronicled and discussed. Though he was a convert himself, Lucas deplored the constant vigils over the state of prospective converts which had become an obsession with Phillipps and his friends. So Lucas wrote openly in *The Tablet*:

Woe be to the man upon whom the curiosity of this all-devouring age has fixed its polluting brand. For such a one the sacred quiet of his life has vanished for ever. The man is watched, and every tick of his soul is minuted. No matter what is going on within him; we stain and soil everything with our licentious craving for novelty. If we think the grace of God is moving him to virtue, we run to the man's window, and there through the glass we note its operations, and daily publish them with scientific minuteness along side of barometrical and meteorological observations. . . . Statistical tables are kept by the curious in such matters. In all companies it is buzzed about, "Well, how is so and so going on now?" To which the answer is (as is usual in the case of *confinements*, spiritual and other), "Oh, he is doing quite as well as can be expected." . . . All this is noted down and sent off post haste to a religious newspaper, and in this sort of pillory alone will they allow the poor wretch to save his soul! Oh, for God's sake let us learn to keep silence about these things; and if we ever must talk about them let our talk have some savour of modesty and reserve.

As one of the chief pioneers of Catholic journalism, Lucas at least preserved a sense of reticence and proportion. He did mag-

## HERALDS OF THE SECOND SPRING 323

nificent service in exposing Catholic grievances and agitating for their removal, and in expressing Catholic doctrine in relation to contemporary problems. But one passage may be quoted which seems singularly apposite to the modern practice of exaggerating the importance of every little event in Catholic affairs:

Alas! we have in our Holy of Holies the same advertisement system—the same system of puffing, proclaiming and hawking about; making known by the ringing of bells and the blowing of trumpets every little bubble that breaks the surface of the rather sluggish and torpid stream which goes under the name of Catholicism in England. Sometimes, indeed, the braying of trumpets is so preposterously loud that the agitation of the air breaks the bubble, and the thing passes away and dies under the vehemence of its own glorification. We confess we hate and loathe this practice of universal publicity, with its consequence, this straining after effect and immediate notoriety.

He had found his feet firmly within those few years. By 1843 he was openly denouncing the Catholic Institute, which represented all the principal leaders of the laity, for its subservient attitude towards the Government's latest Education Bill, which proposed to place the education of all factory children in the hands of the Established Church. Lord Arundel and Surrey had even admitted in the House of Lords that the claims of the Established Church must be "predominant", and that the Bill was "framed in a most just and fair spirit". Lucas felt so outraged that he wrote openly: "This Lord first gives up our right and then licks his enemies' feet for alms! Good English Catholic!" Even Mr Langdale, *The Tablet's* principal supporter, approved Lord Arundel's attitude; but Lucas replied with energy:

Until we read this eulogy; until we saw, from Mr Langdale's own words, the kind of effort it requires in the higher circles to profess oneself a Catholic; until we had this plain proof of the habitual cowardice with which our leaders are in the habit of renouncing or throwing a veil over their Catholicity in "good society"; until we saw even Mr Langdale's perfect unconsciousness that his praise of the individual involves a charge of the most hopeless degradation against the class—we never suspected how universally the deadly poison of religious indifference had pervaded the veins of our Catholic aristocracy.

It is vastly to the credit of Charles Langdale that he did not resent these criticisms, and that he admitted later that the Catholic Institute ought to have put up a fight. A vigorous Catholic opposition was, in fact, organized in almost every parish, and submitted to Parliament without invoking either the Institute or the distinguished laymen who had failed to make a protest. Lucas had taken a chief part in arousing Catholic opinion, and it exerted such pressure that the obnoxious clauses of the Bill had to be dropped. He had incidentally established his position as the champion of the lower clergy and of the new middle class. Before the year ended he had strengthened his position much further by a visit to Ireland, to form closer contact there. It was the year of O'Connell's huge "monster meetings" to demand Repeal, and the unprecedented enthusiasm and magnitude of his agitation converted Lucas once and for all to support of Repeal. He not only recognized that the Irish Catholics solidly demanded an Irish Parliament; he accepted the nationalist principles that underlay the agitation. Thenceforward the position and the distress of the Irish Catholics, both in Ireland and as immigrants in Great Britain, became the chief concern of his life.

He had established a weekly paper which held a unique position in English journalism. Having no serious rivals, it had almost a monopoly as a platform where important questions of Catholic interest had to be discussed. To have done that was an immense achievement for any man little over thirty, who had no personal status as a Catholic spokesman except what he achieved by founding and editing his paper. But he had many direct and active connexions with Catholic good works. The A.P.F. had always commanded his special sympathy. He had also urged the foundation of the St Vincent de Paul Society in England, and was invited to become its first president. But he declined the offer, just as he had resigned the secretaryship of the A.P.F., on the ground that his editorial work might make him a focus of contention, which would injure the society. He retained always a vivid sense of humour, which saved him from any inflated notion of his own importance. When controversies developed he spoke out vehemently on whichever side he favoured: and at times he was backing one bishop against another and all but imputing heresy or treachery to those who disagreed with him.

Through his Irish connexions he became attached particularly to Archbishop MacHale, who was the most vigorous controversialist in the Irish hierarchy, and a man of such strong views that he was often in open collision with the other bishops. Dissensions arose quickly when Sir Robert Peel's Government, after arresting O'Connell and his lieutenants, proceeded to introduce measures which were designed to placate the Irish clergy. Even the increased endowment of Maynooth aroused Dr MacHale's hostility as an attempted bribe, and Lucas shared his suspicions. The Charitable Bequests Act, which was introduced to remedy an intolerable position for Catholics in Ireland, provided for a joint judicial commission, consisting partly of Catholics who were to have sole authority for administering Catholic bequests. That involved encroaching to some extent upon episcopal authority, and Archbishop MacHale denounced it with all his energy as an attempt to undermine the confidence of the people in their bishops. Lucas supported him fully; and when in the following year, 1845, Peel introduced the "godless" Colleges Bill instead of conceding Dr MacHale's demand for definitely Catholic Colleges, Lucas rushed into the fray with impassioned eloquence. The Irish bishops as a whole had accepted the Charitable Bequests Bill, and Archbishop Murray of Dublin and another Catholic bishop had even agreed to serve on the Bequests Board. But Archbishop MacHale was denouncing the whole measure as a diabolical plot to undermine the authority of the Church. On the Colleges Bill similarly the bishops agreed, though reluctantly, to accept it if certain nominal safeguards were provided. But Lucas attacked it with all his energy; and within a few years later he was able to announce the success of MacHale's determined appeal to Rome against his own colleagues in the Irish hierarchy.

Controversy on these lines left no room for any pretence by *The Tablet* to official support on the issues which it made its own. But the vigour and courage and integrity of Lucas made *The Tablet* a real force. When the potato famine devastated Ireland between 1845 and 1847 and swarms of destitute immigrants began to arrive in England, he was able to do much to encourage relief. It was his exposure of the proselytizing condition laid down by certain distributors of famine relief that induced Father

Dominic Barberi to make his famous offer to sell his silver chalice to any pious benefactor, so that the money could be sent to rescue starving Catholic children in county Kerry from the temptation to renounce their faith in order to obtain food. Lucas was stirred as never before by the appalling reports of famine and pestilence, and by the ineptitude of the Government's proposals for relief. Before long he was denouncing the Irish landlords as the direct authors of the famine, because of their heartless extortion of rents while they contributed nothing to improve or equip the little farms, and while even security of tenure from year to year was denied to their tenants. Agrarian disorders broke out inevitably while the famine deepened; and the Irish clergy in their desperate appeals for relief incurred the scandalized protests of Lord Shrewsbury, against what he regarded as incitations to violence on their part. Lucas hit out on all sides; against Lord Shrewsbury for his unimaginative complaints against the Irish clergy; and against the Whigs for their doctrinaire refusal to prevent the export of food from a starving country, and for their refusal to finance constructive works out of government funds.

*The Tablet* had been in existence for nearly ten years before it became impossible for Lucas, in face of so many difficulties and contentions, to continue it as an organ of the English Catholics. Ireland during the famine years had come to occupy so much of its attention that his English readers naturally complained, even when they were in sympathy with his aims. But even on English questions his vehement dislike for both the English parties had made him almost incapable of judging questions on their merits. Wiseman, for instance, on the eve of the restoration of the hierarchy in 1850, desired earnestly that diplomatic relations between England and the Holy See should be established. But to Lucas any such proposal appeared only as an insidious attempt to exploit political influences in Rome against the Catholic clergy both in England and in Ireland. The idea that English politicians were always seeking to govern Ireland through Rome had become an obsession with him, and was substantially true in fact. But it made him incapable of considering dispassionately the problems that were pressing for solution in England until an English hierarchy were restored.

In 1850 he definitely transferred *The Tablet* from London to

Dublin, and thereafter identified himself still more closely with Irish problems and Irish views. Within a few years he had been elected to the House of Commons as member for county Meath. There, for a short time, he found many opportunities for displaying that zeal for Catholic interests which, in the earliest years after his conversion, he had hoped that all Catholics could exert together as a decisive influence in the Imperial Parliament. But he had only a few more years to live after his departure from England to Dublin. By 1856, at the age of forty-five, he was worn out with sheer excess of mental excitement and activity. He had become involved in a deliberate appeal to Rome to protect the clergy from political intrigues and influence. But before his extremely lengthy "Statement" could reach the authorities in Rome he had died in England after an illness which left him helpless but undaunted, and still full of high spirits and good humour, at the home of his wife's people beside the Thames at Staines.

DENIS GWYNN

## NOTES ON RECENT WORK

### ASCETICAL AND MYSTICAL THEOLOGY

ANYONE wishing to have a succinct and at the same time clear account of the ways in which we can know God will find *The Dark Knowledge of God*<sup>1</sup> just the book he is looking for. Those ways are three. There is the way of the unaided reason, the metaphysical approach to God; there is the ordinary way of faith; and there is the higher way of faith, known as mystical prayer. The author, writing with typically French clarity, explains them in the light of Thomistic teaching, and brings them together to show the unity and coherence of the various departments of Catholic thought on this matter. The book is, in a sense, a popularization, in so far as so exalted a subject can be popular-

<sup>1</sup> By Charles Journet, Professor in the Grand Séminaire of Fribourg. Translated by James F. Anderson, Loyola University. Pp. xiii + 122. (Sheed & Ward. 7s. 6d.)



ized, of the labours of M. Maritain in his *Degrees of Knowledge*. It is addressed to "All who seek the face of the true God". It is thus meant to encourage men to undertake the quest for God by explaining the approach, removing obstacles and, in a modest way, enkindling the desire to know Him in the final "unknowing" of love. The English translation is very well done.

*The Spiritual Doctrine of Sister Elizabeth of the Trinity*, by M. M. Philipon, O.P.,<sup>1</sup> describes the way of prayer of a young Carmelite nun who before her early death had attained a high degree of the "unknowing" of love. It is a book very rich in doctrine, containing not only the principles and practices of Sister Elizabeth but also a fine Thomistic commentary by Père Philipon. In assigning the graces of contemplation God draws souls to Himself by making different truths about Him appeal more powerfully to one than to another. The result is rich variety in mystical prayer. It was the fundamental truth of the indwelling of the Holy Trinity which appealed most to Sister Elizabeth. Round that all her spiritual life and her writing centred; in it were unified the other doctrines which nourished her soul; the asceticism of silence, conformity to Christ, a very personal devotion to our Lady of the Incarnation, the operation of the gifts of the Holy Ghost, and the glory of God as the purpose of all creation. One chapter of the book has a special significance for priests. It deals, in the main, with the apostolate of the Carmelite nun in association with the apostolate of the priest. Père Garrigou-Lagrange writes an illuminating preface. Those who have read his writings on contemplation will find them reaffirmed and applied in this book.

Another recent mystical book is *Henry Suso, Saint and Poet*.<sup>2</sup> The writer, S. M. C., is a religious of the English Congregation of St Catherine of Siena, and is already well known as a novelist and hagiographer, with an interest in mediaeval studies. In this latest volume she gives us a most attractively written study of Suso, based on his autobiography (which was "pieusement romancée", according to the *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*) and richly supplied with quotations from his other writings. It is a lovely

<sup>1</sup> Translated by a Benedictine of Stanbrook. Pp. xxiii + 255. (Cork: The Mercier Press. 1 guinea.)

<sup>2</sup> Pp. viii + 167. (Oxford: Blackfriars Publications. 6s. 6d.)

portrait that issues from the various aspects under which the author depicts him; and you realize how truly he was called the Poverello of the Dominican Order, but a Poverello who, under the influence of Eckhart and of the fervour for contemplative prayer which made the Rhine of his day the "Mystics' River", became a leading theologian of this "unknowing" of love. S. M. C. sees in B. Henry Suso a saint for our times; he embodied the spirit of patience, humility and love of the Cross which every one today must learn if the shattered world is to be rebuilt aright; he had, too, for our encouragement, a natural shrinking from the sufferings which his will embraced. The frontispiece of the book reproduces Fra Angelico's portrait of Suso, now in the National Gallery.

In *The Way of the Mystics*, H. C. Graef<sup>1</sup> also has the modern world in view. He wishes to explain to the restless, anxious people of our time what it is that makes mysticism have an attraction for them, and to set forth to them the ideal of perfect love which casts out fear. This he does in a series of studies of the lives and teachings of fifteen famous contemplatives, from St Bernard to B. Anna Maria Taigi, grouped under the headings: Counsellors of Popes and Kings (St Bernard, St Hildegard, St Catherine of Siena, B. Anna Taigi); A Dominican Trio (Eckhart, Tauler, B. Henry Suso); Three Children of St Francis (St Bonaventura, B. Angela of Foligno, Louise Lateau); Two Lovers of the Sacred Heart (St Gertrude, St Margaret Mary); Two Founders of Contemplative Orders (St Teresa, St Francis de Sales); Todo y Nada (St John of the Cross). The author introduces the Lives with an essay on the theological foundations of mysticism, and concludes with a short discussion of prayer and penance as the focal points of the spiritual life. A number of the studies have already appeared in *Blackfriars* and *The Life of the Spirit*. The book is a piece of good popularization, readably written; and it is helpful to have the account of so many contemplatives gathered into one book. The theological introduction strikes one as suffering from brevity; it is better in the practical than in the speculative part; it is Dominican in inspiration, and the writer seems to be somewhat unjust to Poulain.

The crises and uncertainties of the times are also kept in view

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 160. (Cork: Mercier Press. 10s. 6d.)

in a little book, *The Pain of Christ*, by Gerald Vann, O.P.<sup>1</sup> It contains the substance of his Lenten Sermons preached in Westminster Cathedral in 1947, and his very popular Aquinas Paper on *The Sorrow of God*. Gently and persuasively Fr Vann explains the problem of pain, and he offers most helpful guidance to all followers of Christ.

Modern youth is particularly considered in *Merry in God*,<sup>2</sup> which is a second edition (the first was published in 1939) of an anonymous life of Fr William Doyle. It is largely taken, with some rearrangement of the matter, from Professor O'Rahilly's well-known biography. The book should find a large public among the more serious-minded young people, since it is attractively written and published at a very reasonable price.

Mediaeval hagiography was wonderfully enriched soon after the death of St Francis by many beautiful legends (in the ancient sense of that term): the work of Giovanni de Ceprano, Thomas of Celano, Brother Leo and other companions of the Saint, St Bonaventure, and the compiler of the *Fioretti*. In *Saint Francis of Assisi, The Legends and Lauds*,<sup>3</sup> Otto Karrer has brought together for the first time the most attractive of these legends, along with a selection from the writings of St Francis (including the *Cantic of the Sun* and his *Testament*). The editor knits the collection together by introductions, commentaries and notes, distinguished throughout by scholarly judgement. The outcome is a new kind of book on St Francis, giving a full-length portrait, drawn by many hands, and completed reverently and beautifully by a modern scholar who has steeped himself in the romance of Franciscanism. This is undoubtedly a book which should be added to every library of Franciscan literature. A frontispiece reproduces a fresco of St Francis.

*Letters and Shorter Works by Saint John Eudes*<sup>4</sup> is the sixth and last volume in the series *Selected Works of Saint John Eudes* which the Eudist Fathers are publishing in America. It contains nearly 250 letters and excerpts from letters and six other writings. The letters convey a fine impression of the scholarship, judgement and

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 75. (Oxford: Blackfriars Publications. 3s. 6d.)

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 330. (Longmans. 8s. 6d.)

<sup>3</sup> Well translated by N. Wydenbruck. Pp. xvi + 302. (Sheed & Ward. 15s.)

<sup>4</sup> A good translation from the French by Ruth Hauser, M.A. Pp. xxxviii + 339. (New York: Kennedy. \$3.)

range of interests of the Saint. Direction, theological discussion, the affairs of his Congregation, the health and the sorrows of his friends—all are given consideration in his correspondence. This last volume contains an Introduction by the Very Reverend Francis Lebesconte, Superior General of the Eudist Fathers, and, incidentally, a cousin of the Little Flower. "The letters of St John Eudes," he writes, "should not be read superficially or in haste. They are spiritual reading, rather heavy, perhaps, but rich in spiritual thought like the Norman soil from which they are sprung." St John Eudes is not a stylist; but in him it is true that the style is the man. His letters reveal him; he was always the shrewd Norman, but with that shrewdness in financial matters he combined a great tenderness and affability, qualities in him sometimes overlooked even by Catholic writers. The frontispiece reproduces a facsimile of one of the letters; it shows that the saint wrote a good hand, neat and clear.

J. CARTMELL

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

### "BENEDICITE" IN THE BLESSING FORMULA

Why is this word in the plural when it occurs at Prime, at the blessing of incense, and at the beginning of the Grace before meals? (S.)

#### REPLY

i. The choral office in Prime originally concluded with the *Benedicamus Domino* after the prayer *Domine Deus omnipotens*, the remainder from the martyrology onwards being a chapter office in monastic usage concluding with *Benedicite* and its response *Deus*. Though the meaning of these two words is somewhat obscure, the usual explanation is that the presiding prelate is begging with humility a blessing from the brethren who reply *Deus*;

that is to say their answer to his request is that God may give a blessing. The added formula *Dominus nos benedicat* etc. does not appear till the thirteenth century: it is actually redundant since everything it contains is implied in the response *Deus*. However, there is no difficulty in the use of the plural form in this text of Prime since it is used by the hebdomadarius addressing the choir.<sup>1</sup>

ii. The meaning of *Benedicite* at the beginning of the "Benedictio Mensae" is also obscure, and its origin is usually considered to be connected with the monastic salutation expressed by this word, of which there are several indications in the *Regula* of St Benedict, as in chapter xxv which assigns as a punishment "nec a quoquam benedicatur transeunte, nec cibus qui ei datur". There is no very satisfactory explanation why the plural form should always be used in this salutation, and it originally appears to have been also in the singular. At the "Benedictio mensae" its use by the presiding priest offers no difficulty since he is addressing the assembled company; its use in their response may be accounted for by supposing that each member of the company is saluting the rest.<sup>2</sup>

iii. One is tempted, for the sake of uniformity, to give a similar interpretation of the word *Benedicite* at the blessing of incense, and to suppose that it was originally a request for a blessing from all assembled, the response thereto being *Pater Reverende* instead of *Deus*, the deacon in course of time making the response himself by attaching it to the request. But there is no authority whatever for an explanation of this kind: the prayers *Incensum istud* and *Ab illo benedicaris* appear in mediæval missals without the preceding *Benedicite*, and frequently the more correct *Jube domne benedicere* is found instead.

The only remaining explanation is that *Benedicite*, though plural in form, is really an imperative singular. Le Brun, an old writer who deals faithfully with every word of the Mass in defending it against heretics, adopts this view: "Dicitur *Benedicite*, multitudinis numero, tametsi ad unum tantum referatur oratio, quippe quod rude vulgus hac loquendi ratione maiorem obser-

<sup>1</sup> Callewaert, *De Breviarii Romani Liturgia*, § 316.

<sup>2</sup> A different explanation is given in *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, 1936, p. 159, namely that the response is a request from the assembled company asking the presiding priest to bless the food.

vantiam exhiberi putet." He gives a justification for this use of the plural in such terms as *Eminentia vestra*, and suggests that since people of some consequence are accustomed to refer to themselves as "We" it was natural for others to use the plural in addressing them.<sup>1</sup>

### "SECRET" PRAYERS

The popular missal edited by Dom Cabrol states that it is at least doubtful that the "secret" prayers are so called because they are recited silently. What are the alternative explanations? (G.)

### REPLY

*Rubricae Generales*, xii . . . postea fit oblatio cum Orationibus, ut in Ordine Missae. Qua oblatione facta, dicuntur Orationes secretae . . . sed ante primam Orationem non dicitur *Dominus Vobiscum*, nec aliquid aliud, sed dicto *Suscipiat Dominus sacrificium*, absolute dicuntur: neque etiam ante secundam Orationem dicitur *Oremus*.

i. The question is one of the minor difficulties in the history of the Mass and it is not yet satisfactorily settled. All the explanations offered have to take account of the word "secreta", past participle of "secerno", and the commonest is undoubtedly to give the word, which primarily means "separate", its secondary meaning of "private". The prayers are said privately, that is to say in silence, *submissa voce*, because in a sung Mass the singing of the Offertory psalm prevents the prayers being said aloud.<sup>2</sup> Another explanation of the silent recital of these prayers is sometimes suggested: they were whispered in deference to the established tradition that the offering was the act of the people, made through the deacons.<sup>3</sup>

The weak point of this common explanation is that it gives no adequate reason for the presence of the prayers, and what-

<sup>1</sup> *Explicatio* . . . *Missae* (1759), I, p. 163.

<sup>2</sup> Thus Fortescue, *The Mass*, p. 312; Gasparri, *De Eucharistia*, § 907; *Dict. Archdol.*, XI, col. 726.

<sup>3</sup> Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, p. 118.

ever their origin may be it seems that the custom of reciting them secretly was subsequent to their introduction in the liturgy.

ii. A second solution gives to the word "secreta" its primary meaning of "separated", the neuter plural becoming ultimately a feminine singular, as may be noticed in the word "oblata" which occurs so often in liturgical texts: *oratio super oblata* becomes *oratio super oblatam* (hostiam). There are two meanings given to this notion of something separated, both of which are recorded by O'Brien, in his *History of the Mass*, a remarkably informative work considering its age<sup>1</sup> and its popular character.

One meaning associates the word with the separation, the dismissal, of catechumens which occurred just before this point. There is little proof in support of this contention.

A second meaning is related to the separation of the bread and wine from the offerings of the people, which would normally be far in excess of what was required for consecration. Bossuet has pointed out that in some ancient sacramentaries the *oratio super oblata* is described as *oratio post secreta*, which certainly supports this meaning of "separated". Critics, however, observe that accurate references to this phrase are wanting.<sup>2</sup>

iii. A third solution, favoured by Dr Brinktrine,<sup>3</sup> stresses the meaning of "mystery" which is often given to the derivatives of "secerno". What we now call the Preface, as something distinct from the Canon, is undoubtedly an essential part of the *anaphora* or Eucharistic Prayer in its most primitive shape: the versicles *Sursum corda* etc. being found in all its forms. The description of the Eucharistic Prayer as *Mysterium* or *Secreta* is fairly common. It is suggested that our word *Secreta* must be related to the Eucharistic Prayer to which it is attached, and similar examples of a prayer preceding a *praefatio* may still be seen in the missal at the Blessing of the Font on Holy Saturday, and in the Ordinal at the ordination of deacons and priests and the consecration of bishops. Consequently the prayer which was in its origin a gate, as it were, leading to the *Praefatio*, has itself preserved the name of "Secret" or "Mystery".

The prayer has no *Oremus*, since the more lengthy *Orate fratres* takes its place, and the *Amen* which the priest is directed

<sup>1</sup> New York, 1884, p. 283.

<sup>2</sup> *l'Ami du Clergé*, 1947, p. 683.

<sup>3</sup> *Zur Deutung des Wortes Secreta in Ephemerides Liturgicae*, 1930, p. 291.



to say *submissa voce* is accounted for, no doubt, by the same causes that account for the plurality of *Amen* in the course of the Canon.<sup>1</sup>

# EASTER OR ANNUAL COMMUNION

Inasmuch as the law of annual reception is graver, it seems, than that of making one's Communion at paschal tide; and inasmuch as a priest may extend the paschal time, could this time be anticipated? For example, there is a mission during January, when all the people receive Holy Communion. May the parish priest, fearing that many will not go again during the paschal time, declare that the January Communion fulfils the Easter precept? (R.)

## REPLY

Canon 859, §1. Omnis utriusque sexus fidelis, postquam ad annos discretionis, idest ad rationis usum, pervenerit, debet semel in anno, saltem in Paschate, Eucharistiae sacramentum recipere, nisi forte de consilio proprii sacerdotis, ob aliquam rationabilem causam, ad tempus ab eius perceptione duxerit abstinendum.

i. It is true that the law of annual Communion is graver than that of communicating at paschal tide, for the latter is a purely ecclesiastical law, whereas the obligation of an annual Communion is an ecclesiastical declaration of what is actually a divine law from John vi, 54 seq. The computation of paschal tide is clear in the common law of canon 859, §2, and local indults often anticipate or extend the time beyond the extensions permitted in the canon. But the computation of the year is not certain, various estimates about its beginning and ending being possible: we prefer the view which fixes the beginning of the year for this purpose from the day on which the obligation of the Easter precept begins,<sup>2</sup> and if this view is accepted, the answer we suggest to the above question is also more easily formulated. The solution of all questions arising from this canon requires us to bear in mind

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Theological Studies*, 1945, p. 380.

<sup>2</sup> THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1940, XIX, p. 74; Coronata, *De Sacramentis*, I, § 322.

that there is a double precept contained in it, and though the one may be graver than the other, they both certainly bind *sub gravi*.

ii. "Proprius sacerdos" in this context means not only the parish priest but probably the confessor as well,<sup>1</sup> and the parish priest as such enjoys no special faculties in the matter. It is certain that the priest may sanction an extension of the time for Easter Communion for any reasonable cause, that is to say the law does not require a *grave* cause. The writers suggest as adequate reasons: the case of a sick person when it is not convenient to receive Communion at home; the circumstances of a person travelling abroad who, being unable to speak a foreign language, prefers to wait until returning to his own country; or when persons are not yet fully instructed, as might often happen with the first Communion of children. In all these and similar instances the canon does not speak of the priest dispensing from the observance of law, but of his counselling a recipient to postpone Easter Communion.<sup>2</sup>

There is no warrant, either in the canon or in the opinion of commentators, for counselling the anticipation of paschal time. What might easily happen is that some persons attending the January mission have not observed the grave law of Easter Communion for the previous year, and have not yet kept the still graver law of annual Communion for the current year; by communicating at the mission they fulfil the annual obligation, but they must communicate again when the paschal time commences in order to fulfil the paschal tide obligation.

iii. It is recognized, however, that it might often be for the good of souls to permit the precept of annual Communion to cover that of Easter as well, no matter at what time of the year Holy Communion is received, and indults may be obtained for this purpose from the *Congregation of the Council*. Thus the French Capucins, with the consent of the local Ordinary, may declare that the reception of Holy Communion during a mission given by these fathers fulfils the Easter precept for that year: "(Conceditur ut) Christifideles, qui sacris missionibus atque exercitiis spiritualibus interfuerunt, quae a concionatoribus praefatae

<sup>1</sup> THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1939, XVI, p. 547.

<sup>2</sup> *Collationes Brugenses*, 1937, pp. 164 and 492.

Provinciae (Savoy) in variis Galliae paroeciis constituuntur, per sacramenta Poenitentiae et Eucharistiae durante cursu missionis aut exercitiorum suscepta, quocunque anni tempore praecepto annuae confessionis et Communionis paschalis satisfacere valeant."<sup>1</sup> A similar faculty is enjoyed, we believe, by the Society of Jesus, and no doubt by other religious Institutes engaged in giving missions and retreats, its lawful use being always conditioned by the local Ordinary's consent.

# CHURCHING: STOLE CEREMONY

Since this rite is not a purification but a thanksgiving, why does it include certain penitential features such as the direction that the woman shall kneel at the church door and be led to the altar holding the priest's stole? Women sometimes rather resent the implications of these rites. (X.)

## REPLY

*Rituale Romanum*, VII, iii, I . . . ad fores ecclesiae accedat, ubi illam (puerperam) foris ad limina genuflectentem et candelam accensam in manu tententem, aqua benedicta aspergat. . . . 2. Deinde porrigens ad manum mulieris extremam partem stolae, ex humero sinistro pendentem, eam introducit in ecclesiam. . . .

i. In the primitive rite of this blessing there was included the notion of "purification" which has now almost completely disappeared. This notion was due to the fact that Our Blessed Lady herself observed the Mosaic law contained in Leviticus xii, and the Christian rite began as an imitation of Our Lady's Purification; in many ancient rituals, indeed, the rite is described as a purification.<sup>2</sup> It must be observed, however, that the purification in question was only legalistic, and in no sense considered to be a cleansing from some kind of moral stain. Our Lady was not properly speaking bound to observe the ritualistic purification,

<sup>1</sup> *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, 1940, p. 128, quoting *Il Monitore*.

<sup>2</sup> *Maynooth Council*, 1927, n. 305, refers to "ritus purificationis".

since the circumstances of Christ's birth were not those described in Leviticus; that she nevertheless did so, in a spirit of humility and obedience, encouraged Christian mothers to imitate her example, and the Church provided a rite for the purpose in order to sanction what the Ritual still refers to as "*pia et laudabilis consuetudo*", although the stress is now exclusively on the notion of rendering thanks to God for a safe delivery.

We think that, historically speaking, the existing rubrics quoted above must be traces of the notion of ceremonial purifying which has now completely disappeared from the title and words of the rite, a notion which everyone is rightly anxious to suppress, lest an entirely false idea of motherhood should be encouraged.

ii. If we take the rubrics and the rite as we have it in our current ritual, together with the law on the subject, the traces of what used to be a purificatory ceremony are capable of an explanation which relates solely to the idea of thanksgiving.

Humility, both in word and gesture, is at all times appropriate to Christian worship, and most of all in an act of thanksgiving to God for benefits received. Though resembling the stole ceremony on introducing catechumens at Baptism (*Ingredere in templum Dei*), the use of a white stole at Churching indicates the difference: if the action symbolized the rehabilitation of a mother as part of a ceremonial purifying, the colour of the stole would certainly be violet. Neither our word "Churching" nor the French word "*Relevailles*", both of which are reminiscent of rehabilitation, are to be found in the vocabulary of the liturgy; and whatever may be the popular idea, there is no liturgical rule which requires the mother not to enter the sacred precincts until after receiving the blessing. We cannot remember any other rite, except Baptism, in which the priest's stole is used to conduct the recipient of a blessing into the church, and it is therefore difficult to attach a meaning to it which is unconnected with some kind of rehabilitation. The lighted candle and procession to the altar are strongly reminiscent of the Candlemas rite, and it could be said, perhaps, that the action of accompanying the priest, whilst holding the end of his stole, far from indicating rehabilitation, is a privilege which is not found in any other blessing.

Were this rite one of rehabilitation or purification, it would

seem that it could more fittingly be used for unmarried mothers. Exactly the opposite, however, is implied in many local rituals which direct that the blessing is to be given only to mothers who have borne children in lawful wedlock; and, though the modern common law does not refuse it to the unmarried, it is agreed that they have no strict right to it.<sup>1</sup>

iii. Finally, we must remember that there is no common law obligation in the Latin Church for women to receive this blessing after childbirth. If the Church considered it to be a purifying or rehabilitating rite, it would no doubt be obligatory for women to receive it. Should the above reasons fail to convince, any mother who views the rite with repugnance may be told not to ask for this blessing, unless local law directs parish priests to exhort women to receive it, as in *Madras Statutes*, 1942, n. 331.

# CONVERTS AND NUPTIAL BLESSING

Is there an obligation on married converts to receive the nuptial blessing after their reconciliation? (R.)

## REPLY

Canon 1101, §1. Parochus curet ut sponsi benedictionem sollemnem accipiant, quae dari eis potest etiam postquam diu vixerint in matrimonio, sed solum in Missa, servata speciali rubrica et excepto tempore feriato.

*S. Off.* 26 June, 1860; *Fontes*, n. 961. Quaeritur utrum coniugibus qui, postquam in infidelitate nupserunt, ad fidem convertuntur, supplendae sint caeremoniae matrimonii. *Resp.* Coniuges infideles, si fideles facti sint, optime facere si Ecclesiae benedictiones recipiant; adstringi tamen ad id non debere.

The question can only arise, of course, when both parties are Catholics. Firstly, there is no obligation to receive the nuptial blessing if they do not want it. This is clear from *Fontes*, n. 961, and from the word *curet* in canon 1101, §1, which must be given, in our opinion, the meaning attached to it by the *Code Commis-*

<sup>1</sup> THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1940, XVIII, p. 347.

sion, 12 November, 1922, interpreting canon 1451; namely it means "suadendum".

They should, however, be encouraged to receive it because the Church has always attached great value to this blessing. The practice is not common, but it cannot be said that the contrary custom has obtained the force of law with us. It will be necessary to make it quite clear to the parties and to others present in the church that the ceremony is not the sacrament of marriage. Since a nuptial Mass is always preferable, this is also to be recommended; the words "solum in missa" of the canon explain the common law on the subject, without taking account of the indult, which we enjoy, permitting the nuptial blessing to be given *extra missam*.

The other ceremonies, subsequent to the exchange of consent, are equally advisable from the reply of the Holy Office, namely those contained in the *Ordo Administrandi*: n. 5 "Benedictio annuli" and n. 7. We think n. 6 "With this ring" etc. should be omitted since it is a part, though not an essential part, of the consent.

#### CONFIRMATION: APPARENT DEATH

Called to administer the last sacraments to a person who died just before I arrived, I absolved and anointed him conditionally, as recommended by modern writers. He had not been confirmed, and I wondered afterwards whether I should have administered conditional Confirmation as well? (W.E.)

#### REPLY

With all the reservations applying to the conditional administration of the last sacraments in such cases,<sup>1</sup> we cannot discern any reason at all why Confirmation should not be included. Up to the appearance of the new decree on the subject<sup>2</sup> the point was not discussed by the commentators, since it was scarcely of any practical value. Since the decree, the only reference to the point that we have seen is in *l'Ami du Clergé*, 1947, p. 617, where the writer decides that there is no reason for excepting

<sup>1</sup> Cf. THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1932, III, p. 228, and 1941, XXI, p. 114.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid* 1947, XXVII, p. 54.

Confirmation from the theological teaching about administering sacraments to the apparently dead. Unlike Extreme Unction the Ritual makes no provision for a short form in cases of necessity; following the existing principles, and on analogy with them, the form will be "N, si vivis, signo te", etc.

E. J. M.

---

## ROMAN DOCUMENTS

### THE CANONICAL FORM OF MARRIAGE

#### MOTU PROPRIO

(ABROGATUR ALTERUM COMMA PARAGRAFI SECUNDAE CAN. 1099  
(A.A.S., 1948, XL, p. 305).

#### PIUS PP. XII

Decretum *Ne temere*, decessoris Nostri fel. rec. Pii X iussu latum, statuerat (art. XI) omnes in Ecclesia catholica baptizatos, etiamsi ab eadem postea defecissent, teneri ad servandam matrimonii formam in Concilio Tridentino definitam.

Verum ne irrita evaderent matrimonia eorum qui, ab acatholicis nati et in Ecclesia catholica baptizati, ab infantili aetate in haeresi vel schismate aut infidelitate vel sine ulla religione adolevisent, in Codice Iuris Canonici statutum fuit huiusmodi baptizatos non teneri ad canonicam matrimonii formam servandam.

At experientia triginta annorum satis docuit exemptionem a servanda canonica matrimonii forma, huiusmodi in Ecclesia catholica baptizatis concessam, bono animarum haud emolumento fuisse, immo in solutione casuum saepe saepius difficultates multiplicasse; quamobrem Nobis visum est expedire ut memorata exemptio revocetur.

Et ideo Nos, auditis Em̃is ac Reṽm̃is Patribus Supremae S. Congregationis S. Officii, Motu Proprio ac de plenitudine Apostolicae potestatis, decernimus ac statuimus omnes in Ecclesia catholica baptizatos teneri ad canonicam matrimonii formam servandam; abrogamus itaque alterum comma paragraphi secundae can. 1099, et iubemus ut verba *item ab acatholicis nati, etsi in Ecclesia catholica baptizati, qui ab infantili aetate in haeresi vel schismate aut infidelitate aut sine ulla religione adoleverunt, quoties cum parte acatholica contraxerint* ex can. 1099 expungantur.



Hac autem arrepta occasione, Missionarios ceterosque Sacerdotes admonemus ut iidem praescripta canonum 750-751 sancte servant.

Mandamus igitur ut hae Litterae Apostolicae Motu Proprio datae in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* referantur, ac statuimus ut, quae in iisdem iussa sunt, vim suam exerant a die 1 Ianuarii anni MCMXLIX.

Contrariis quibuslibet non obstantibus, etiam peculiari mentione dignis.

Datum ex Arce Gandulphi, prope Romam, die 1 mensis Augusti, in festo S. Petri in Vinculis, anno MCMXLVIII, Pontificatus Nostri decimo.

The exemption which is abrogated from 1 January, 1949, was not recognized in the text of *Ne Temere*, but we were directed in 1911 to have recourse to the Holy See in each individual case. Cf. THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1947, XXVII, pp. 52 and 215.

The number of cases of this kind, in which recourse was had to the Holy See, seems to have had an influence on the compilers of the Code, which expressly provided for the situation in the latter portion of canon 1099, § 2. It has been a continual source of doubt and confusion, and the commentators have never provided a satisfactory criterion for deciding the meaning of being brought up from infancy in heresy, infidelity or irreligion. Replies of the *Code Commission* have enlarged the category of persons whose marriages would be valid from this section now abrogated, but no published replies solved the real legal problem, which is now admirably settled by abrogating the exceptive clause altogether. Cf. an article on the clause and its official interpretation in THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1939, XVI, p. 511, and replies to queries in 1945, XXV, p. 35 and p. 122.

This rather drastic treatment will be welcomed by everyone and may, perhaps, be extended to other canons in the future. All marriages, however, contracted up to 31 December, 1948, are subject to the Code law, so that cases to be decided under the abrogated section will remain, though in decreasing numbers, for a few decades.

## REPLIES OF CODE COMMISSION

RESPONSA AD PROPOSITA DUBIA (A.A.S., 1948, XL, p. 386).

Eni Patres Pontificiae Commissionis ad Codicis canones authentice interpretandos, propositis in plenario coetu quae sequuntur dubiis, responderi mandarunt ut infra ad singula:

I—*De forma celebrationis matrimonii*

D. An per praescriptum can. 1097 § 2, *in fine*, derogetur canonibus 1099 § 1, n. 3.

R. Negative.

II—*De dispensatione ab impedimentis matrimonialibus*

D. Utrum can. 1052 ita intelligendus sit ut dispensatio impetrata pro certo et determinato impedimento valeat etiam pro alio impedimento eiusdem speciei in aequali vel inferiori gradu, quod in supplici libello bona vel mala fide reticuitum fuerit; an potius ita tantum ut dispensatio ab impedimento expresse non vitietur per reticentiam alius impedimenti eiusdem speciei in aequali vel inferiori gradu.

R. Affirmative ad primam partem, negative ad secundam.

Datum Romae, e Civitate Vaticana, die 8 m. Iulio a. 1948.

M. Card. MASSIMI, Praeses.

---

AN INDULGENCE APPLICABLE TO WAR  
VICTIMS

SACRA PAENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA

(OFFICIUM DE INDULGENTIIS)

DECRETUM

PLENARIA CONCEDITUR INDULGENTIA IN FIDELIUM SOLAMEN CAUSA  
POSTREMI BELLII VITA FUNCTORUM (A.A.S., 1948, XL, p. 94).

Ss̃nus D. N. Pius div. Prov. Pp. XII, in Audientia ab infra-  
scripto Cardinali Paenitentiario Maiore die 21 mensis Februarii ver-  
tentis anni habita, preces quorundam Sacrorum Antistitum liben-  
tissime excipiens ac paterna caritate in tot carissimos filios ob  
immane bellum vita peremptos permotus, benigne concedere  
dignatus est ut christifideles omnes qui, confessi, a Dominica  
Palmarum ad Dominicam in Albis, occasione scilicet Praecepti  
Paschalis, Sacra Synaxi refecti fuerint et ad mentem Sanctitatis  
Suae preces fuderint, Indulgentiam plenariam, animabus fidelium

causa postremi belli vita functorum tantum profuturam, consequi valeant. Praesenti pro hac vice tantum valituro, contrariis quibuslibet minime obstantibus.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus S. Paenitentiariae Apostolicae, die 23 Februarii 1948.

N. Card. CANALI, *Paenitentiarius Maior*.

## CONFESSIONS IN AEROPLANES

### MOTU PROPRIO

DE FACULTATE AUDIENDI CONFESSIONES SACERDOTIBUS AËRIUM ITER ARRIPIENTIBUS CONCEDENDA (*A.A.S.*, 1948, p. 17).

#### PIUS PP. XII

Animarum studio compulsi, cum huic Apostolicae Sedi nonnulli significaverint locorum Ordinarii opportunum esse praescripta can. 883 C. I. C., circa facultatem audiendi confessiones sacerdotibus maritimum iter arripiuntibus factam, ad aëria extendere itinera, Nos, plane noscentes huiusmodi itinera impraesentiarum cotidie frequentiora evadere ac volentes ut christifidelibus haud desit commodum quod e laudato Ordinariorum desiderio animarum proveniret sanctificationi, magna cum animi Nostri oblectatione eiusmodi amplectimur votum ac motu proprio, certa scientia et matura deliberatione, de Apostolicae potestatis plenitudine, statuimus ac decernimus ut quae can. 883 C. I. C. de facultate excipiendi confessiones sanciantur pro sacerdotibus maritimum iter habentibus, valeant atque extendantur, consentaneis quidem clausulis, ad sacerdotes iter aërium facientes.

Quae per Apostolicas has Nostras Litteras decrevimus motu proprio datas, firma ac valida in perpetuum manere praecipimus, contrariis quibuslibet minime obstantibus; ac praeterea iubemus ut ea vigere incipiant simul ac eadem praesentes Nostrae Apostolicae Litterae in Commentario Officiali *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* nuncupato insertae fuerint.

Datum Romae, apud Sanctum Petrum, die xvi mensis Decembris anno MCMXXXVII, Pontificatus Nostri nono.

#### PIUS PP. XII

Opinion was divided on this point; cf. *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, 1941, XX, p. 552; *Periodica*, 1945, pp. 32-41. We think "portus" of canon 883 is now to be interpreted as including an "air-port", even though the aeroplane is not crossing the sea.

EXTRAORDINARY MINISTER OF  
CONFIRMATION

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE PROPAGANDA FIDE

DECRETUM

DE CONFIRMATIONE ADMINISTRANDA IIS, QUI EX GRAVI MORBO IN PERICULO MORTIS SUNT CONSTITUTI (*A.A.S.*, 1948, XL, p. 41).

Post latum a Sacra Congregatione de Disciplina Sacramentorum decretum "Spiritus Sancti munera" diei xiv Septembris an. 1946 (cf. *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, vol. XXXVIII, 1946, p. 349) ad Sacrum hoc Consilium Christiano nomini propagando plures Ordinariorum missionum preces, ad easdem amplioresve facultates obtinendas, pervenerunt.

Quas Ss<sup>us</sup> D. N. Pius Div. Prov. Papa XII, in Audientia diei xviii huius mensis, referente infrascripto Cardinali Praefecto, benigne suscipere dignatus est.

Omnibus itaque Ordinariis locorum ab hac Sacra Congregatione de Propaganda Fide dependentibus potestatem Sanctissimus fecit, absque praeiudicio ceterorum indultorum quibus in re iam fruuntur, ut Sedis Apostolicae indulto (can. 782 §2), tribuere valeant omnibus sacerdotibus sibi subditis curamque animarum gerentibus, facultatem sacram Confirmationem fidelibus sive adultis sive infantibus, intra fines missionalis circumscriptionis exstantibus et in mortis periculo constitutis, valide ministrandi; necnon licite in ipso loco residentiae Episcopi, absente tamen quolibet Episcopo vel legitime impedito; servataque formula a Rituali Romano statuta.

Praesens vero decretum eadem Sanctitas Sua confici publicique iuris fieri mandavit.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, die xviii mensis Decembris, anno Domini MCMXXXVII.

P. Card. FUMASONI BIONDI, *Praefectus*.

Although priests on foreign missions have enjoyed for many years a limited faculty of administering Confirmation, the decree "Spiritus

Sancti munera" (THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1947, XXVII, p. 54) seemed to require that missionary clergy should also have their powers extended. The terms of this present decree may not be applied to priests delegated by "Spiritus Sancti munera"; thus in *mortis periculo* is a clause which is wider than *ex gravi morbo*.

---

### MARRIAGE CAUSES DURING 1947

(A.A.S., 1948, XL, p. 186).

For the first time that we remember the causes judged on the heading *vis et metus* come only second in the list, nineteen being successful and seven not.

The majority were concerned, in one way or another with consent, chiefly through excluding *bonum prolis*: out of thirty-two judgments twenty were successful.

Impotence or non-consummation was proved to exist in ten out of fifteen cases.

Of the remaining cases one *amentia* and one *consanguinity* succeeded; and through defect of form or *clandestinity*, one was successful and one not.

E. J. M.

---

### BOOK REVIEWS

*The Religious Orders in England*. By Professor David Knowles. Pp. 348. (Cambridge University Press. 30s. net.)

EIGHT years have passed since Dr Knowles published his authoritative history of monastic life in England from the time of St Dunstan down to the fourth Lateran council. Perhaps not the least striking tribute to the merits of that work lay in the fact that it elicited no audible protest from the late Dr Coulton. Even that veteran of anti-Catholic and anti-monastic controversy was silenced by the author's wide and exact scholarship, critical acumen, and perfect candour. Since then Dr Knowles has been appointed to the chair of Mediaeval History in Dr Coulton's old university. He now brings out a second instalment of the work, again under the imprint of the Cambridge University Press, and with all the typographical advantages which that implies.

The earlier volume was entitled *The Monastic Order in England*. This one, by its more comprehensive title, indicates an enlargement of the original plan. The various orders of friars, from the epoch of their establishment in this country, receive no less attention than the old monastic orders. Thus every manifestation of Regular life in England is fully covered, down to 1340, the period from that date to the dissolution being reserved for treatment in a third and final volume.

One glance at the bibliography is enough to show how vast a corpus of materials has been digested into these pages. Professor Knowles marshals his array of detail with unfailing skill. With a few incisive sentences (and with due acknowledgement of the late Fr Benedict Zimmermann's researches) he dissipates the cloud of bogus history that has enveloped Carmelite origins. He does justice to such notable English friars as Haymo of Faversham and Alexander of Hales, who left an indelible mark on the religious history of Europe, yet are almost unknown to their countrymen of modern times. If his narrative is to some extent a story of defection from the highest ideals, he deals faithfully and soberly with this aspect of the period. Only once does he show signs of hesitancy, and that is when he has to deal with the records of episcopal visitation. In a remarkable passage he expresses his regret that it should be necessary to make any use at all of such intimate documents, documents which, as he says, contain information given in private and in confidence. "The dead as well as the living have a right to their good name, and the accidents of time which have made public property of the visitation dossiers do not of themselves entitle the historian to bruit abroad the failings and weaknesses, the vagaries, the quarrels and recriminations of those long since gone to their reckoning." If this doctrine were accepted in all its rigour, it would seem to preclude the historian from using such material as the Paston Letters, and indeed any private correspondence, diaries, and personal memoranda. Happily the author's practice here is sounder than his principle. He devotes two chapters to the visitation records, and after a critical examination of their contents declares that the majority of houses visited show nothing worse than "a decent mediocrity". His final verdict on the monastic orders, given as he says after many years of deliberation, is that by the end of the thirteenth century they had lost the unique position which had made them, in the time of Anselm, the salt of the earth, but that the greater abbeys "were still offering a framework within which a devout and worthy life could be lived." This, to be sure, is no higher claim than might

be made for the average farmhouse and workshop; but preceded as it is by a recital of names now unfamiliar though celebrated in their own day for outstanding holiness, as well as by a fascinating account of the monastic achievement in historiography, calligraphy, and the architectural arts, it may fairly be held to err on the side of understatement.

Professor Knowles has placed all students of the period in his debt. No other writer has attempted so comprehensive a survey; and it is a safe prediction that this volume, like its predecessor, will take rank as a standard work.

H. P. R. F.

*A History of the Church.* By Philip Hughes. Vol. I: *The World in which the Church was Founded.* 326 pp. and 1 map. 21s. Vol. II: *The Church in the World the Church made. Augustine to Aquinas.* 463 pp. and 3 maps. 25s. (Sheed & Ward.)

THE third volume of Fr Hughes' *History of the Church* appeared last year. We now have a second edition of the first two volumes which have long been out of print since their first appearance in 1934 and 1935 respectively. The re-setting of the type for these two volumes has given Fr Hughes an opportunity to revise the text, of which he has taken full advantage.

A comparison with the earlier edition reveals numerous points of correction, evidence of the meticulous care with which the author has examined his work. Ambiguities have been eliminated, some dates corrected, others added, paragraphs have been re-set and frequent changes effected to render the style even more readable. Considerable additions have also been made to the index, a difficult task in any book, but an invaluable aid to the reader of a work covering so wide a field as this does. The time charts have been replaced by more easily accessible chronological tables of popes and secular rulers. The printing and binding are now similar to those of the more recent Volume III.

A lengthy note in each volume explains the purpose and range of the bibliographies, now overhauled and brought up to date. The inclusion of new footnotes and references reveals that good use has been made of the newer works mentioned, of Fliche and Martin's *Histoire de l'Eglise* particularly. Fr Hughes must in fact be congratulated on his judicious choice of books for further reference. His avowed principle, which he has obviously followed in practice, is to offer only the works of specialists who, by frequent reference, maintain the link between the original sources and their own reconstruction.



Fr Hughes has already established his reputation as a master in the art of summarizing the work of specialists and arranging a mass of facts into an intelligible account, without sacrificing accuracy for brevity. It is a source of wonder indeed how much detail he has retained in those volumes without muddling the reader or losing the main thread of the narrative. No other work in English of such a relatively small size can compare with this survey of Early and Mediaeval Church History.

This re-edition offers several entirely new sections, in the second volume particularly. Most of these additions or revisions are concerned with giving greater detail or precision to the narrative as told in the earlier edition, without any serious modification. They are valuable, nevertheless.

The *De Civitate Dei* of St. Augustine now receives due mention for the importance of its influence upon later centuries as a source of mediaeval political ideas. But the promise of additional copy at pages 84-86 appears to be due to an error, possibly of printing; careful comparison of the first and second editions has revealed nothing new at the pages mentioned.

Another interesting revision adds greater detail and exactitude to the early history of the Crusades. Urban II's appeal to the chivalry of the West to join in the reconquest of the Holy Land is often represented as a sudden action on the part of the Pope. In the earlier edition, Fr Hughes described him as "yielding apparently to a sudden inspiration". Historical revision usually proves that such sudden decisions were in fact the culmination of long discussion and preparation. This incident is no exception. Fr Hughes now sets forth the part played by Alexander II and Gregory VII in earlier campaigns against Islam. Urban II himself, the heir to Gregory VII's large-hearted plans, held conferences with noted soldiers of his time before launching his famous appeal.

But the two main topics upon which the views of Fr Hughes in this new edition have been eagerly awaited are surely the Investiture Contest of the late eleventh century and the Eastern Schism.

The Investiture Contest is carefully described in Fr Hughes' work. The new edition contains some valuable additions explaining the points of view of the opposing parties in the quarrel. As the author is at pains to emphasize, the issue was a vital one both for the Church and for secular rulers, for the German Emperor particularly. The reformers of the eleventh century were above all concerned with the suppression or prevention of simony in ecclesiastical appointments, and with clerical incontinency. But experience

taught them that as long as certain lay rulers held control of bishoprics, they would pay more attention to administrative ability than to spiritual qualities. The question of simony and nicolaism thus included the secondary one of the control of appointments to major positions in the Church. Now, in the institution of a bishop by the lay power there were two elements: the choice of a candidate, and his Investiture as the holder of the see. Custom had given the Emperor control over both elements.

The late Dr Z. N. Brooke put forward in 1939<sup>1</sup> the view that the early part of the conflict, between Gregory VII and Henry IV, was not concerned uniquely with the Investiture with staff and ring, but with the larger issue of the control of nomination of prelates. In Dr Brooke's view there were two contests: the first a Contest of Clerical Appointment, the second (c. 1106-1122) a Contest of Clerical Investiture, the Investiture Contest in the proper sense. By the Concordat of Worms in 1122 the German King renounced Investiture by staff and ring and accepted the free election of bishops, while the Pope (Calixtus II) conceded that the elections should take place in the King's presence, provided they were free and without simony.

M. Fliche, whom Fr Hughes follows on this question, does not distinguish clearly the two elements in the controversy. Certainly he does not distinguish two stages in the contest. Consequently the decree of 1075 against Investiture is put forward as the main legislative act of Gregory VII while the decrees of 1078 and 1080 concerning canonical election are given far less prominence. The Concordat of Worms is described by Fr Hughes as "a compromise . . . which registered the victory of principles for which the Popes during eighty years had contended, namely that bishops should not, as of right, owe their promotion to the lay sovereign" (Vol. II, p. 239). Dr Brooke's estimate of the Concordat was rather the reverse: "By concentrating on lay investiture," he declared, "the papal party lost their ultimate aim. The King . . . by renouncing investiture gave up the shadow and retained the substance. Gregory's purpose was defeated when what he intended as a means became an end." Dr Brooke points out that the final renunciation of the royal share in episcopal elections was not made until nearly a century later by Frederick II.<sup>2</sup>

The learned Cambridge historian's reconstruction was of course

<sup>1</sup> Z. N. Brooke, Litt.D.: *Lay Investiture and its Relation to the Conflict of Empire and Papacy*. Raleigh Lecture on History Delivered before the British Academy, 1939. (Humphrey Milford. 2s.) Cf. also THE CLERGY REVIEW, July 1940, article by Rev. Andrew Beck, A.A., B.A.

<sup>2</sup> Op. cit, p. 27.

propounded only in a brief essay. Yet it remains a constructive *mise au point* which merits serious consideration. Fr Hughes does not recommend or refer to the essay. In any case, Dr Brooke's view requires the maturing which only time and discussion can give it. Since M. Fliche is generally recognized as the greatest modern authority on Gregory VII, Fr Hughes has done an excellent piece of work in summarizing, for the benefit of English readers, the lengthy studies of this eminent French historian. But if Dr Brooke's reconstruction is to be accepted, at least in its main lines, then much of M. Fliche's work is already out of date, rather because of a shifting of emphasis than by a denial of facts.

Fr Hughes' principal revision in this new edition is concerned with an entirely different subject, the Eastern Schism, on which we are given, probably for the first time in an English work of this kind, the conclusions of a number of Oriental specialists.

In regard to the Photian Schism particularly, he covers entirely new ground, disentangling the web of intrigue and counter-accusation to produce a very readable account of one of the major historical discoveries of recent times. The accepted story of two periods of schism due to Photius, 863-869 and 879-893, has been discredited within the past fifteen years, since it has been proved that the second schism never really existed at all.<sup>1</sup> Significantly the number of bishops present at the Eighth General Council at Constantinople (869-870), formerly said to have been 103 at the first session, is now shown to have reached that figure only for the last session: the Council opened with barely a dozen bishops present. We owe this astonishing historical revision to the work of the Czech historian Fr Frantisek Dvornik and of the Assumptionist *Ecole des Etudes Byzantines*, notably of Frs Venance Grumel and Vitalien Laurent, A.A. M. Amann, another pioneer in this field, has written the relevant sections in Volumes VI and VII of *Fliche et Martin*. Fr Hughes can be justly proud of his presentation of the facts as they are now known; on the merits of this section alone, the new edition is well worth buying.

Further important revisions, though hardly of the same drastic kind as those relating to Photius, have been made in the account of the schism of Michael Cerularius. Again, Fr Hughes' fresh and clear approach to a question enables the reader to follow the main developments in a maze of intrigue and in the interplay of political events and motives upon ecclesiastical relations. More careful study

<sup>1</sup> For a fuller discussion, see THE CLERGY REVIEW, Nov. 1938: "Propaganda in History", by Rev. A. Beck, A.A., B.A.

has proved, as in the case of the first Crusade, that events did not take place with unpredictable suddenness. Cerularius was bent on maintaining and establishing as a normal state of affairs the separation which had in fact existed between Rome and Constantinople for at least thirty years previously. East and West had drifted apart. The Byzantine reconquest of South Italy embittered the Latins and the Norman Conquest of the same country embittered the Greeks. When Latins and Greeks tried finally to unite against the overpowerful Normans, Cerularius saw a possible danger to his policy of *de facto* independence. The clumsy and ill-considered efforts of the papal legates at Constantinople were of considerable assistance to the Byzantine Patriarch. The story has its sequel in the recriminations between Latins and Greeks during the early Crusades. Fr Hughes has told the story with his habitually objective judgement, making good use of modern work on the subject. He has given abundant proof already of his ability to give praise or blame, where either is due, in a detached, impartial, fashion.

English Catholics owe a debt of gratitude to him for the immense labour he has undertaken to present such a balanced and authoritative history. On many topics Fr Hughes' brief accounts have proved superior not merely to general works of the same scope, but also to more specialized studies. That surely indicates the care with which the author has examined and prepared each stage of his work. It is no exaggeration to say that we await with impatient confidence the completion of this History in Volume IV.

R. K.

*The King's Good Servant.* Papers read to the Thomas More Society of London. (Basil Blackwell, Oxford. Pp. 112. Price 8s. 6d.)

LORD RUSSELL OF KILLOWEN thus describes the activities of this society: its members "meet and share a dinner *maigre* about twice a term on a Friday. As an aid to the digestion they secure the kind attendance of some eminent authority who after dinner addresses them or reads a paper on a subject of which he is master". Whether the dinner be satisfying or not it is certain that the members enjoy an intellectual feast after it. The papers under review deal with intellectual and moral problems connected with law and legislation, and every topic discussed is a live issue today.

Mr Richard O'Sullivan has an introductory essay on "Changing Tides in English Law and History". He argues that the trial and execution of St Thomas More were turning points in English law. Until then the law of England had been subordinated to divine positive law and natural law, and in harmony with them. Any law

contrary to these was considered immoral and consequently null and void. At his trial More had protested against the Act of Supremacy on the plea that it was grounded on an "Acte of Parliament directly repugnant to the laws of God and His Holye Church". With the failure of this plea the course of English law was changed and "judges became obliged to admit that acts of legislation, no matter how morally unjust, must be obeyed". Instead of law being based on Christian principles a return was made to the old pagan concept, "*quod principi placuit legis habet vigorem*", and it is significant that while Henry VIII prohibited the study of Canon Law he encouraged the study of Roman civil law in its place. So it has come about that in our own day the Attorney General can say, "Parliament is sovereign; it can make any laws. It could ordain that all blue-eyed babies be destroyed at birth." The essay ends on a note of confidence, however, for the writer sees in English and international law the beginnings of a return to Natural Law.

The papers that follow deal with the necessary reintegration of law and morality. M. Maritain, in "*La Philosophie du Droit*", expounds the teaching of St Thomas Aquinas and points out how More both studied and appreciated the teachings of scholastic philosophy; and it is perhaps a pity that this interesting paper, originally delivered in French, was not translated for the benefit of the general reader. In an able essay which discusses the relation between Law and Conscience, Fr Hilary Carpenter, O.P., observes how the cleavage between these leads inevitably to the destruction of both; he deplores the segregation of religion from philosophy, maintaining that when philosophy is unallied to religion it becomes as a ship without a rudder, and the true purpose and very content of human nature is lost to sight. Most interesting of all, perhaps, are the two papers in which Fr Beck, A.A., deals with "The Common Good in Law and Legislation" and with "Law and Liberty". What is this Common Good to which all law is directed? And what if it should clash with the good of the individual? Fr Beck emphasizes the fact that the personality attributed to the State is a fictitious one; the only true persons are human individuals. "As a moral entity the State exists to subserve the end of the only realities—its citizens. And the common good of the community is the good of its constituent members and ultimately that good is the right of each to the free pursuit of the good life." To achieve this they may make reasonable appeal against any society or government.

Among other important contributions we would call special attention to a lucid essay by Dr Hawkins on "Punishment and Moral Responsibility"; his presentation of the problems involved and of

their possible solutions is a model of precision and clarity of thought, and his own conclusion is notable for its good sense, a quality somewhat rare in this branch of jurisprudence.

The book is well bound, clearly printed, and not unreasonably expensive.

J. B. C.

*St Dominic in Early Tuscan Painting.* By George Kaftal, D.Phil. 95 pp., 41 plates. Demy 8vo. (Blackfriars, Oxford. 7s. 6d. net.)

THIS charming little book will be a valuable contribution to the history of St Dominic, for whereas hitherto one had to search for his portrait through expensive volumes on Fra Angelico, Francesco Traini, and others, we have now for the first time between two covers photographic reproductions of all the early Italian paintings of this great Saint.

The pictures are divided into two sections, the first being a series of fifteen images of St Dominic. One can hardly call them portraits for at this early period likenesses were conveyed more by types, habits of dress and accessories than by facial exactness; a fact that is clearly borne out by these reproductions, for in some the saint is tonsured, in others bald; in some he is represented as clean-shaven, in others he has a beard. But in all, besides the Dominican habit, there is some customary emblem that immediately identifies him, such as the Star, the Book, the Lily and the Rosary, the history of which Dr Kaftal deals with in his scholarly preface.

The second half of the book is made up of scenes from St Dominic's life, arranged chronologically in order to illustrate the development of the iconography. Many of these scenes occur in the life by Jordan of Saxony, St Dominic's contemporary and first biographer, but the first to contain them all was Theodoric of Appoldia's *De Vita et miraculis S. Dominici, et de Ordine Praedicatorum quem instituit*, written about 1290. For this reason the plates in the present volume are accompanied by relevant extracts from Theodoric's work; a happy device which renders the book not only more valuable as a historical study, but enables it to be used as an aid to devout meditation.

The make-up of the book is itself worthy of mention, being produced entirely on art paper, St Dominic in the group pictures being picked out by a system of darker printing. There is a comprehensive Bibliography and Index of Sources, and each picture is thoroughly documented.

We shall look forward to the companion volumes by the same

author on St Catherine, St Peter Martyr and St Thomas, for like this one they will appeal not only to the scholar, but to all who revere these Dominican saints and love to look at them through the eyes of the great masters.

J. L. L.

*The Forsaken Fountain.* By Rosalind Murray. Pp. 210. (Hollis & Carter. 12s. 6d.)

MISS MURRAY has taken a large subject to discuss in a comparatively small book. She is therefore constrained to be somewhat impressionistic, to set out her views rather than analyse, develop and prove them to the full. Her aim is to appeal for a more contemplative approach to life; an approach which too many ignore or are unaware of, today particularly, when the intrusion of democratic ideas into the sphere of knowledge leads to an undue emphasis on superficial information and to an over-estimation of individual opinions, however ill-founded or, indeed, bizarre they may be. Miss Murray insists rightly that true knowledge is knowledge in depth, which aims at discovering and grasping the root principles of philosophy and comes to see that all our knowledge must lead to and be unified in God.

As types of the contemplative Miss Murray considers natural mystics—the hero, the lover, the mantic, and especially the poet—and the genuine Christian mystic. She compares and contrasts the poet and the saint. Both are knowers in depth, intuiting that which is beyond sense and time. But the poet is often unaware of the ultimate source of the spiritual light which transfigures the world for him, and he is never wholly free from the inner conflict and tension which the demands of poetical technique impose upon him. Again, the poet, however exalted his vision seems to be, remains often morally unchanged by his half-glimpse of that which “Time in mists confounds”. The fact is that the poet is not, in the Christian sense, a *mystique manqué*. The likeness of Keats or Wordsworth to the Christian contemplative is only analogous. The saint and the poet, who is not a saint, differ in kind and not merely in degree; and the difference may be summarized in the single word, “faith”. Christian mysticism is supernatural.

One may not agree with all that Miss Murray says. But undoubtedly she leads one into the high places of thought. It is stimulating to share with her these noble altitudes of the mind and leave behind for a time the flat places and the dull outlook in which perforce so much of one's life must nowadays be passed.

J. CARTMELL



*Saint Albert the Great.* By S. M. Albert, O.P. Pp. 144. (Blackfriars Publications, Ltd., Oxford. Price 7s. 6d.)

To provide, within the limits of 144 pages, an adequate and well proportioned portrait of St Albert as man, saint, natural scientist, philosopher and theologian is no easy task; and Sister M. Albert is to be congratulated upon the skill and devotion that she has brought to it. The historical background and the spirit of the Saint's age are well delineated and, above all, the sanctity of the man is shown as the mainspring of all his marvellously varied activities. "Although," writes the author, "we can talk of 'science' in the abstract, the ultimate responsibility rests with the men who study it." Here is the keynote of this brief but illuminating life of one who, canonized and declared Doctor of the Church by Pius XI, has by his successor been most appropriately styled Patron of the Natural Sciences. At no time as in our own has the hierarchy of the sciences been so flagrantly ignored, never has it needed so much to be carefully observed; the subordination of the study of creatures to the study and knowledge of God is the chief feature of St Albert's life, and it is the timely lesson that we need to learn from his age.

*Sixty Saints for Boys.* By Joan Windham. Illustrated by Mona Doneux. Pp. x + 404. (Sheed & Ward. 12s. 6d. net.)

AN omnibus volume of Miss Windham's delightful stories for children was to be expected, and her many readers, young and old, will welcome this excellent collection of her saints for boys. They are arranged chronologically to cover the history of the Church up to modern times: beginning with St James and ending with St Gerard—St Michael, who lived "Right at the Beginning of Things", appearing suitably in a sort of epilogue. Though entitled *Sixty Saints for Boys*, the volume will appeal almost equally to girls who, if they have been properly brought up, cannot fail to be interested in their brothers' patron saints and, for that matter, their fathers' too. Included in the collection are the hitherto unpublished stories of St James, St Denis, St Cyril, St Giles, St Patrick, and St Philip Benizi. Miss Mona Doneux illustrates the text attractively and often amusingly.

G. D. S.

## CORRESPONDENCE

## ARTIFICIAL INSEMINATION

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1945, XXV, pp. 268, 335, 381; 1948, XXIX, p. 359, XXX, p. 144)

The Rev. J. Mullin writes:

In THE CLERGY REVIEW for August last Canon Mahoney invited comment on a new discovery which a correspondent ("F.M.D.") informed us had been made in the treatment of the form of paralysis known as *paraplegia*—partial or total paralysis of the lower part of the body. A drug is injected into the spinal canal and as a secondary effect of this treatment an ejaculation of semen follows in the majority of cases. F.M.D. states that through process of insemination of the semen thus secured marriages condemned to sterility have been rendered fruitful, and he asks if a Catholic sufferer may avail himself of his discovery.

I venture to offer first a note on the purely medical aspect which, while agreeing with F.M.D.'s statement, considers this discovery to be restricted in its practical value. A medical friend writes: "The drug mentioned in the article is not named, but I presume it is prostigmine, normally a depressant of skeletal muscle but discovered recently to have a stimulating effect on the reproductive organs after intra-theal injection in paraplegics. Ejaculation follows erection in about fifty per cent of cases and may occur without erection; this points to its therapeutic limits. Only certain types of paraplegics would be able to have intercourse with full co-operation of the female partner; this also points to its therapeutic limits. Unpleasant side-effects such as vomiting and sweating follow the administration of prostigmine in some cases. Puncture of the spinal theca is simple enough and is used regularly in medicine in diagnostic and therapeutic procedures. But serious complications such as meningitis can and do arise, and I can hardly envisage a professional man using it regularly to promote what the article calls a normal domestic existence."

On the moral side of the question the arguments from the Holy Office decree of 1897 and from canon law against any use of human semen for artificial insemination, no matter by what means obtained, have already been given in full in this REVIEW. (No reference is intended, of course, to "assisted" insemination which is not properly artificial insemination at all.) In view of the increasing importance of the subject perhaps one might be permitted to add here the argu-

ment from reason—a purely ethical one and none other than a traditional argument against solitary sin. Man has no dominion over human life. But semen is the principle of human life, or, as St Thomas says, it is “homo in potentia et vita humana in potentia propinqua” (*De Malo*, V a.2). The argument which permits artificial insemination seems to prove too much; it seems to prove that direct solitary pollution is not a sin. Its supporters (e.g. Vermeersch, *Theol. Moralis*, vol. IV, p. 59, ed. 3) make much of the fact that it is obtained without delectation. (By that very token, then, it would be medically useless, as I have previously proved in these pages, XXIX, p. 359). But the question of delectation is irrelevant. Delectation as such is neither good nor bad: it takes its morality from the act which it accompanies. If it is permissible to take the semen at all, then why not take it by the more easy and natural way of direct pollution (cf. Merkelbach *Quaest. de Castitate*, ed. 4, p. 61)? To the supporters of the more conservative view this fatal conclusion seems inescapable.

One realizes that a confessor, as Canon Mahoney reminds us, must permit the milder view to a penitent on the principles of probabilism. I do suggest, however, that among many of the parochial clergy there is a growing anxiety about the whole question. It has ceased to be a theoretical discussion among the manualists and review writers. The popular Press has been full of it; it is to be discussed in full at the Congress of Catholic doctors in Rome next April; a committee set up by the Archbishop of Canterbury has just issued a lengthy report; and I see that in France a group of doctors, theologians and others have published a full-dress symposium on the whole subject.<sup>1</sup> Would it not be dangerous to attempt to explain to untrained minds the gossamer-fine casuistry of the few theologians who support this view? Moreover, since the interpretation of a Holy Office decree is in question and the matter is now of much importance for the faithful, would it not be advisable to act always with the idea clearly in mind that a Roman condemnation of this view is a practical possibility?

#### NICHOLAS OF ST ALBANS

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1948, XXX, pp. 85—95)

The Rev. Ailbe J. Luddy writes:

I have read with lively interest Mgr Davis's reply to my remarks on Nicholas of St Albans. The writer is right in supposing that, when preparing my article, I had not an opportunity to consult the

<sup>1</sup> L'insémination artificielle. (Lethielleux, Paris, 1948.)

Bodleian MS, and I thank him sincerely for acquainting me with its contents. Although I cannot share his esteem for the man who deliberately put in circulation a slanderous story calculated to bring discredit, not alone on St Bernard, but upon the entire Cistercian Order, I am bound to admit that the evidence of the manuscript, assuming its authenticity, proves Nicholas to have held what is in essence the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, however imperfectly apprehended and crudely expressed. But I still maintain that the Letter in Migne contains passages, particularly the statement that Mary differed from other holy virgins only by her immunity from carnal concupiscence, irreconcilable with that doctrine. Nor can this immunity be considered as implying the Immaculate Conception, because Nicholas himself tells us it was due "to the incapacity of nature till her twelfth year and thereafter to the influence of grace". How the two positions can be harmonized it is not easy to see.

Another point on which I feel dissatisfied is the way Mgr Davis understands the sinfulness attributed by St Bernard to Mary's conception. A careful study of the Letter to the Canons of Lyons will, I think, convince the unprejudiced that the Saint is here taking sin in the Pauline sense of concupiscence, and conception for the generative function. Cf. an article on the Immaculate Conception in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for June 1925. I may add that the "mediaeval views" Mgr Davis refers to (p. 93) might serve as a solvent for most of the arguments adduced to show that Bernard was opposed to the doctrine defined in 1854. Finally, my courteous critic refuses to see in the words of Peter, *Credo et juro nostram Beatissimam Virginem, aeterna praedestinatione singulari privilegio munitam, nec a sua conceptione in aliquo violatam, sed semper mansisse et permansisse illibatam*, a formal profession of faith in the Immaculate Conception, saying that it merely implies that from the time of her conception, in a sense exclusive of the *terminus a quo*, Mary was free from sin—as if the phrase *a conceptione* was equivalent to *post conceptionem*. This surely is indefensible. When Goliath is said to have been a warrior *a juventute sua*, it does not mean that he took up soldiering after his youth was spent! Besides, such immunity from sin would not be a singular privilege in Mary, since, as Peter believed, it was common to Jeremias and the Baptist, with a purely accidental difference in time.

Let me add as a postscript that what I have written has been written, not so much against Nicholas or anybody else as in vindication of Bernard and Peter. And now in imitation of the Stagirite I protest: *Amicus Bernardus, amicus et Petrus, sed mihi semper magis amica est veritas.*

Mgr Davis replies:

I am grateful to Father Luddy for kindly inviting me to harmonize the obscurity of Nicholas' letter with the clearness of the Bodleian MS. First, it must be remembered that Nicholas was always afraid to assert the Immaculate Conception categorically, since the Church had made no decision. Secondly, I suggest that the passage in which Nicholas speaks of the singularity of Mary in comparison with other virgins refers to singularity in her virginity. If she had felt the temptations of the flesh without giving way to them she would have had no superiority as a virgin over other virgins, since this can be said of them all. Mary's singularity, he thinks as opposed to Peter, is that she did not even feel these temptations.

As for St Bernard, I think Father Luddy will find that I do not ascribe any view to him. I am content to say he leaves the matter obscure. Why, for instance, does he say that Mary was born holy like John the Baptist, but was afterwards preserved from all sin, unlike all other men (*ab omni deinceps peccato immunem*)? Since he has ascribed original sin to John, why did he not say that Mary was different from John in this also, and not merely in being free from sin after birth? My own feeling is that this latter is all Peter of Celles means when he speaks of Mary being free from sin. I agree with Father Luddy about the possible translation of *a*, but does not Peter, like St Bernard in a similar context, mean by *peccatum* actual sin?

CARDINAL ERSKINE  
CARDINAL ANTONELLI  
CARDINAL WELD

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1948, XXX, pp. 248ff)

We are grateful to several of our readers who have pointed out that Cardinals Erskine and Antonelli are incorrectly described as laymen; the former was already a subdeacon and the latter a deacon before receiving the Cardinal's hat. We are indebted to His Lordship Bishop Myers also for reminding us that Weld was a curate at St. Mary's, Chelsea, from 1821 to 1824.—THE EDITOR.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

ar-  
the  
was  
lly,  
the  
m-  
she  
she  
nce  
sed

not  
ter  
like  
all  
sed  
om  
h?  
he  
out  
n a

ut  
as  
on  
d-  
at